



Lamma

A Journal of Libyan Studies

2# 2022

لَمَّة

مجلة للدراسات الليبية

Lamma

A Journal of Libyan Studies

2022 • #2

Edited by

Adam Benkato Leila Tayeb Amina Zarrugh

L A M M A
A JOURNAL OF LIBYAN STUDIES



EDITORS

Adam Benkato, *University of California, Berkeley*
Leila Tayeb, *Northwestern University in Qatar*
Amina Zarrugh, *Texas Christian University*

ADVISORY BOARD

Ali Ahmida, *University of New England*
Anna Baldinetti, *Universita degli Studi di Perugia*
Igor Cherstich, *University College London*
Mia Fuller, *University of California, Berkeley*
Mansour El-Kikhia, *University of Texas, San Antonio*
Ines Kohl, *Aktion Regen*
Nora Lafi, *Zentrum Moderner Orient*
Zahra' Langhi, *Libyan Women's Platform for Peace*
Madghis Madi, *Activist & Scholar*
Khaled Mattawa, *University of Michigan*
Amal Obeidi, *University of Benghazi*

Design Adam Benkato • Typeset in Kigelia, Kigelia Arabic, and Kigelia Tifnagh
Cover and inside images Blqees Zuhair • *Punctuation* Wesaal Gibril based on
traditional Ghadamsi numerals and BNF ms. arabe 188

Translations of Lamma's mission statement by
Madghis Madi (Tamazight) *and* Hasan Kadano (Tebu)

Correspond with us at lammajournal@gmail.com
<https://escholarship.org/uc/lamma>

ISBN 978-1-68571-154-2 (print) • 978-1-68571-155-9 (ePDF)
ISSN 2642-861X (print) • 2642-8628 (online)
LCCN 2020941553 • DOI 10.53288/0504.1.00

Lamma: A Journal of Libyan Studies is published by punctum books, Earth, Milky Way
under a Creative Commons Attribution – NonCommercial – NoDerivs 4.0 Unported License
<http://www.punctumbooks.com> • © 2022 by the Editors and Authors

Gîrki muro meyelle ekedimîee êski kûdi ngurtai daha ndoji yê deledi yê hôkora tusa-ã yê adaga-ã yê terih nû Lîbiya du toguſî çîi yêe ngûrtii. Ôwonni, nîsturu ni kûdi a koi kînjigi-ĩ yunu budi čuwudurru kor du yêkindirie, tunda arrangurã kor du, tahasusa yê tira (menheja) yê kîye yê yila ſiſa mundu hu duna yendiri. Gunna du mura du nggo karaduda-ã budi duna čendudo yugonnã ha. Yuna duna yendiriã, ndogudi di gunú ; dagi di, guru ada mura: Anturbûluji yê abi yê yili ammaa-ã (gender) yê terih-ã yê ka-ã yê edemma yê musika-ã yê karaa ndogusaa-ã yê dîn-ã yê bûrne kara-ã yê ſeeſe-ã yê gône kara-ã yê, mède karaa ada ha hokindiã yê taraktuda-ã yê kayuga hundã yê. Tunda gunna du barada tira êski-todurkuda ha yê soûa yê he yibeduda ni, zaga deledii di ni, karaa istaamar-ã du bu yuna togusudaã ha su arbiduda-ã ha duna yendiri. Gîrki, kôî kôe ada gunna hoktundu ni, turo turo ho etterčînîe ni, minbar baradida-ã yê arbidida-ã yê hurgusda-ã yêe. Lîbiya du yê yuga yê gunna. Mêdi « Karaa Lîbiyaa-ã » ha zabčindu yibeyindu ni, hana-yodurkîe yingal du. A gu yingal du meyelle-ã čer hunã mêdi « Gîrki » di čon. Ndûrtu hunã ni, hokti yê čabti yê.

لَمَّةَ مجلة أكاديمية جديدة تهدف الى توفير منصة حوار لفهم ونقد الأفكار المعقدة والقيم والتكوينات الاجتماعية والتاريخ والواقع الملموس الحالي في ليبيا وبالملاحظة والتأكيد على وجود الحاجة الملحة لمثل هذه المنصة، نحن نعطي بقدر الإمكان أهمية لمجموعة واسعة من التخصصات والمصادر والمناهج لاسيما تلك التي في السابق لاقت إهتماماً قليلاً من العلماء. وهذا يشمل على سبيل المثال لا الحصر في الأنثروبولوجيا، الفن، الجندر، التاريخ، اللغات، الأدب، الموسيقى، الأداء، الدين، علم الاجتماع، السياسة، والدراسات الحضارية، بالإضافة الى الإهتمام بالمواضيع المشتركة بين هذه العلوم وتقاطعاتها ومجالاتها الفرعية. ونحن مهتمون بشكل خاص بنشر البحوث التي تقوم على مناهج مبتكرة ونظرية وأسلوب نقدي ضمن الدراسات المتعلقة بفترة ما بعد الإستعمار. «لَمَّة» مكانٌ تتفاعل وتتأثر فيه هذه المجالات ومنبرٌ للباحثين والباحثات، والكتاب، والنشطاء من داخل ليبيا وخارجها لكي يقوموا بإعادة تعريف وتشكيل مصطلح «الدراسات الليبية». ومن هذا المنطلق اخذت المجلة اسمها من كلمة «لَمَّة» و المقصود بها هو اللقاء والاجتماع.

Lamma aims to provide a forum for critically understanding the complex ideas, values, social configurations, histories, and material realities in Libya. Recognizing, and insisting on, the urgent need for such a forum, we give attention to as wide a range of disciplines, sources, and approaches as possible, foregrounding especially those which have previously received less scholarly attention. This includes, but is not limited to: anthropology, art, gender, history, linguistics, literature, music, performance studies, politics, religion, and urban studies, in addition to their intersections, their subfields, the places in between, and critical, theoretical, and postcolonial approaches to them. *Lamma* is a space where these fields interact and draw from one another, and where scholars and students from inside and outside of Libya gather to redefine and reshape "Libyan Studies." We believe that access to research is not the privilege of a few but the right of all and that knowledge production should be inclusive. For these reasons the journal takes its name from the Arabic word *lamma* "a gathering."

C O N T E N T S



The Tuareg Dialect of Ghat in 1850	9
<i>Lameen Souag and Adam Benkato</i>	

Methods and Sources for a New Generation of Libyan Studies: A Roundtable

Introduction	85
<i>Leila Tayeb</i>	
Research on Language in Libya	89
<i>Adam Benkato</i>	
Challenges and Promises Related to Research on Women and Public Space in Tripoli, Libya	97
<i>Fathia Elmenghawi</i>	
Field Research in Libya	105
<i>Asma Khalifa</i>	
Knowing Libya: Ethnography	111
<i>Leila Tayeb</i>	
Libyan Studies: A Call to Sociology	117
<i>Amina Zarrugh</i>	
Responses to Ali Ahmida, <i>Genocide in Libya</i>	
Uncovering Concealed Pasts, Centering Silenced Knowledges	131
<i>Khaoula Bengazi</i>	
Qtelni ash-shar	137
<i>Ouissal Harize</i>	
Rising from <i>Shar</i> : A Meditation on the Future of our History	141
<i>Khaled Mattawa</i>	

Ayt Innej: The Oasis Folks <i>Ibrahim al-Imam translated by Safa Elnaili</i>	153
Review of <i>In Vested Interests: From Passion to Patronage, The AbdulMagid Breish Collection of Arab Art</i> <i>N. A. Mansour</i>	167
Review of <i>Women in the Modern History of Libya</i> <i>Tasnim Qutait</i>	171
Review of <i>Religion as Resistance: Negotiating Authority in Italian Libya</i> <i>Ali Abdullatif Ahmida</i>	175
موسسة تجرّد ومهمة العمارة والفنون الإصلاحية في ليبيا وما وراءها ساري الفيتوري	١٩٠

We are thrilled to present the second issue of *Lamma* to our readers and colleagues. Our hope, as with our inaugural issue, is that the contributions here open up space for interrelated discussions on a variety of topics, almost all largely neglected in the contemporary scholarly study of Libya. The focal point of this issue is the reflective contributions by members of a roundtable discussion 'Methods and Sources for a New Generation of Libyan Studies' which was organized by Leila Tayeb at the MESA conference in 2020. We also mark the publication of Ali Ahmida's watershed book on genocide in colonial Libya with a trio of responses. As ever, we believe in the generative power in dialoguing with and between works of art, literature, and scholarship as we seek to shape and re-shape new discussions on, about, from, and in Libya.

We also call for submissions to our upcoming issues, and especially encourage those whose work touches on Libya in some way but who have not typically thought of it as being part of a 'Libyan studies', and those whose research and creative work on Libya may not find engagement in typical academic outlets. We accept works in English, as well as any language of Libya. For submission guidelines, please consult our website.

Finally, it remains to thank our contributors for entrusting us with their work, our publishers, Madghis Buzakhar for translations into Tamazight, Wesaal Gibril for the wonderful recreation of traditional Ghadamsi numerals and punctuation, Nasser Meerkhan for help with translation into Arabic, Moad Musbahi, Blqees Zuhair; and all the above as well as our readers for their patience and support.

THE EDITORS

يسعدنا تقديم العدد الثاني من مجلة **لَمّة** إلى قرائنا وزملائنا الأعزاء. أملنا منذ العدد الأول هو أن تفتح مساهمات المؤلفين باب النقاش حول مواضيع مختلفة أُهمل أغلبها في النقد الليبي المعاصر. يتمحور هذا العدد حول المساهمات التأملية للأعضاء المشاركين في ندوة "مناهج ومصادر لجيل جديد من الدراسات الليبية" والتي نظّمها ليلى الطيب في مؤتمر MESA في عام 2020. في هذا العدد كذلك ثلاث ردود نقدية تتناول صدور كتاب علي احميدة البارز عن المجازر في ليبيا في مرحلة الاستعمار. وإذ نسعى إلى تشكيل - بل وإعادة تشكيل - حوارات جديدة عن ليبيا ومنها وحولها وفيها، فإننا ما زلنا نؤمن بالقدرة التوليدية للحوار مع أعمال الفن والأدب والنقد وبينها.

ندعوكم كذلك إلى إرسال أعمالكم لنشرها في أعدادنا القادمة، خصوصاً إن كانت تلك الأعمال تتطرق إلى ليبيا بشكل أو بآخر ولكنكم لم تعتبروها عادةً جزءاً من "الدراسات الليبية". كما نشجّع المؤلفين الذين قد لا تنسجم مجالات بحثهم أو نصوصهم الإبداعية مع المنشورات الأكاديمية التقليدية أن يرسلوا لنا كتاباتهم. نقبل النصوص باللغة الإنجليزية إضافة إلى أي لغة محكية في ليبيا. يرجى زيارة موقعنا للاطلاع على إرشادات التقديم.

واخيراً يبقى لنا ان نشكر المساهمات\ين، دار النشر لدينا، الاشخاص التالية: مدغيس بوزخار، وصال جبريل، ناصر ميرخان، معاذ مصباحي، بلقيس زهير، وكذلك قراءنا الكرام على الدعم والصبر التي نقدرها كثيراً.

فريق التحرير

The Tuareg dialect of Ghat in 1850

1. Introduction

Between 18-26 July 1850, two European travellers working for the United Kingdom's Foreign Office, James Richardson (1809-1851) and Heinrich Barth (1821-1865), visited the town of Ghat in southwestern Libya. Among their goals was to provide their compatriots with linguistic data on the languages of the Sahara, then as yet little known to Europeans. During this short stay, Richardson arranged for the translation of a list of words and phrases into the Tuareg variety spoken by the Uraghen tribe of the area, variably termed Tamahaq or Tamajeq by its speakers at the time (see 2.3). In a letter sent from Ghat, he wrote:

I have been fortunate in procuring a good collection of dialogues (A) and a vocabulary of most of the common words (B), in the Tuarick dialect of the tribes in Ghat. I employed for this object Mohammed Shereef, nephew of the Governor of Ghat [El-Haj Ahmed ben El-Haj Es-Sadeek], who is a competent Arabic scholar. The English equivalents of the vocabulary may not correspond with the Arabic or Touarick, but I had not time to make a better translation.¹

The dialogues and vocabulary were taken from an Arabic phrasebook published in 1844,² leading to frequent incongruity of its Middle East-oriented content in a Saharan environment, and to mismatches between its Levantine Arabic and the Libyan Arabic familiar to Rich-

1 Letter from James Richardson to Viscount Palmerston, Ghat 24 July 1850, received Nov. 13. (FO 101/30). Published with emendations in Richardson, *Narrative of a Mission to Central Africa Performed in the Years 1850-51*, vol. 1, 17.

2 Kayat, *The Eastern Traveller's Interpreter; Or, Arabic Without a Teacher*.

ardson's interlocutor. It did have, however, the advantage of including some vocabulary rarely documented for the region, such as 'firman' (*tasəfləst*), 'letters' (*ilaffän*), or 'sects' (*isan*), as well as displaying some rare loanwords, such as 'want' (*əžyäl/ähyaäl*), 'printing-press' (*ättabäy*), 'Turkish' (*taturkit*) or 'English' (*takəlizit*). The results provide considerable amounts of data relevant to sociolinguistic variation in Ghat, confirming the otherwise anomalous notations of Freeman and proving the importance of variation even within a single idiolect, including for reflexes of the key Tuareg shibboleth *z > h vs. > z, ž. These phrases also reveal some morphological archaisms not otherwise attested in Northern Tuareg or in Tuareg in general, most notably traces of a person marking system matching the Ghadamsi "future".

The manuscript sent by Richardson was duly archived, and sat in the Public Record Office for decades to come, in a folder labelled F.O. Tripoli No. 77. Francis W. Newman (1805-1897), a linguist interested in Berber who looked at other materials gathered by Richardson,³ shows no sign of having examined this one; it contains none of his penciled annotations, and when later listing sources for Tuareg, he makes no mention of it.⁴ It was concisely described by Benton, who states that the English handwriting in the dialogue collection is Barth's.⁵ Richardson's materials were subsequently moved to the National Archives at Kew, where the dialogue collection is now to be found under the code FO 101/30.⁶

This document, written down by a citizen of Ghat who appears to have been fluently bilingual in Tamahaq/Tamajeq and Arabic, is the earliest documented record of the Tuareg variety spoken around Ghat, apart from short undated Tifinagh inscriptions which remain difficult

3 For Richardson's documentation of the Berber variety of Sokna in central Libya and Newman's work on it, see Souag, "Sokna re-examined: Two unedited Sokna Berber vocabularies from 1850."

4 Newman, *Libyan Vocabulary. An Essay Towards Reproducing the Ancient Numidian Language Out of Four Modern Tongues*, 6

5 Benton, *The Languages and Peoples of Bornu*, 169.

6 The collection can be accessed at the following URL: <https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C3481060>

to interpret.⁷ To this day the speech of Ghat remains one of the least well documented Tuareg varieties, with the only available descriptions over a century old. The earliest to appear was a brief grammar sketch and Tamahaq-English vocabulary compiled by the English colonial administrator Henry Stanhope Freeman in 1860 with an interlocutor named Sheikh Mohammed Aússuk, a judge of Ghat who Freeman worked with in Ghadames.⁸ Then, in 1879 the Africanist and explorer Gottlob Krause compiled a selection of texts dictated in both Tamajeq and Hausa by an Uraghen elite named Hajj ‘Uthman bin ‘Umar, the grandson of a former king of Ghat, who he worked with in Tripoli.⁹ Lastly, Mohamed Nehlil, a Kabyle linguist and officer in the French colonial administration, gathered some stories and other texts from ‘Ali bin Ahmad bin Mhammad Goundi, a merchant from Ghat resident in Tataouine, and published them, together with a grammatical description and French-Tuareg vocabulary in 1909.¹⁰ Richardson’s are thus also the only older materials to have been collected in Ghat itself. The apparently very similar dialect of Djanet just across the border in Algeria is if anything less documented, but the few materials available have the advantage of being more recent: a study of date palm terminology by Sigwarth, and a limited but magisterial study by Prasse based on a

7 Biagetti, Ait Kaci & di Lerna, “The ‘written landscape’ of the central Sahara: recording and digitising the Tifnagh inscriptions in the Tadrart Acacus mountains.”

8 Freeman, *A Grammatical Sketch Of The Temahuq or Towarek Language*.

9 Krause, *Proben der Sprache von Ghat in der Sahara: mit haussanischen und deutscher Übersetzung*. Krause (p. 5–7) preferred the term “Maschagisch” (= *māšāḡ*) for the language, arguing that forms such as Touareg and Tamažaq were not historical-linguistically correct; this did not catch on in subsequent work. Krause also made reference to two short transcribed, untranslated texts recorded from a member of the Kel Gheres tribe near Ghat that Barth had apparently sent to ZDMG, which published them anonymously in 1853 (ZDMG 7, p. 234); Krause (p. 22) states that he will translate and analyze them in his book, but they do not appear.

10 Nehlil, *Etudes sur le dialecte de Ghat*. An Arabic translation of this work has more recently been published: Muḥammad N Hlil (tr. ṢAbd Allāh Ṣāw), *Dirāsāt fī lahjaṭ Ghāt: dirāsa nahwiyya fī t-tanawwuṣ al-lughawiyy li-Amāzīgh Ghāt*.

brief period of work with three speakers.¹¹

12

The 19th century materials make it clear that bilingualism in Hausa was widespread around Ghat, then as now; as noted, Krause's interlocutor wrote texts for Krause in both Tamajeq and Hausa.¹² Bilingualism in Arabic was also already present, and would increase over time; a recent PhD thesis by Libyan scholar Salah Adam reveals indications of language shift from Tamahaq to Arabic among younger generations.¹³ In this changing and contact-intensive context, early materials such as this manuscript provide a useful point of comparison. Moreover, while Tuareg varieties generally have been well documented and studied, that of Ghat, or southwestern Libya generally, is the major exception.¹⁴ It therefore appears useful to make these materials available to researchers in Libya and worldwide. We thank Maarten Kossmann and Marijn van Putten for very helpful suggestions and corrections; the errors that must inevitably remain are, of course, the authors' responsibility and not theirs.

2. Notes

Comparison to Kayat's phrasebook on which these Tamahaq materials were based makes it clear that the pages of this manuscript were bound in the wrong order, with each pair of pages after p. 4 reversed. The corrected order is thus as follows: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 5, 8, 7, 10, 9, 12, 11, 14, 13, 16, 15, 18, 17, 19, 20. With a few omissions, this covers the entire phrasebook (pp. 20-81), apart from the narrowly Palestine-focused appendix on pp. 167-172. The remainder of Kayat's phrasebook is largely dedicated to vocabulary, and formed the basis for a Ghat wordlist elicited in a separate attachment which will be published in a subsequent study.

In general, the text of the source was closely followed. However-

11 Sigwarth, *Le palmier à Djanet: Etude linguistique*; Prasse, "Renseignements sur le touareg de Djanet (Algérie)."

12 Krause, *Proben der Sprache von Ghat*, 21

13 Adam, *A sociolinguistic investigation of language shift among Libyan Tuareg: The case of Ghat and Barkat*, and "Multiple attitudes and shifting language ideologies".

14 Kossmann, *A Grammar of Ayer Tuareg (Niger)*, 5-7.

er, a few phrases were omitted, sometimes presumably for religious reasons (especially in the missionary dialogue), sometimes because of likely incomprehension, sometimes probably just out of haste. The Levantine Arabic of the source was evidently somewhat foreign to the people of Ghat, and some resulting misunderstandings can be discerned, as discussed below. In total, this phrase list consists of 328 phrases, a few of which occur multiple times due to their repetition in the different dialogues.

2.1 Sociolinguistic context

Despite the brevity of their stay, the journals of Barth and Richardson provide some observations about the sociolinguistic situation of Ghat around 1850. The townsmen of Ghat itself, according to Richardson, were principally “people of Moorish origin, but mixed,”¹⁵ like the Governor, who was “a stranger to the place and a native of Tawat” (i.e. Touat, in present-day southern Algeria).¹⁶ Richardson adds that he was “of Arab extraction,” and had been “settled here twenty years.”¹⁷ The translator, as seen above, was the Governor’s nephew, described by Barth as “his nephew, Ahmed Mohammed Sherif (the man who came to meet us), a clever but forward lad, of pleasant manners--whom, in the course of my travels, I met several times in Sudán” (i.e. the Sahel).¹⁸ The town and area were ruled by the Ajjer (“Azgar”) Tuareg, an elite minority divided into five “families” or “clans” (*tewse*) among whom the Uraghen or Auraghen were the most important, giving their name to this vocabulary.¹⁹ The majority were not members of these clans but rather *imghad* vassals.

15 Richardson, *Narrative of a Mission to Central Africa Performed in the Years 1850-51*, 160.

16 Barth, *Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa*, 193.

17 Richardson, *Travels in the great desert of Sahara, in the years of 1845 and 1846*, vol. 2, 20.

18 Barth, *Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa*, 194.

19 Barth, *Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa*, 198-199.

2.1.1 Multilingualism

14

On his previous arrival in Ghat, on 15 December 1845, Richardson needed a “Touarghee and Arabic interpreter.”²⁰ The primary language of communication for travellers from the north was evidently Arabic; Richardson (1848) quotes the Governor telling him “Ma nâraf [ما نعرف], ‘I don’t know’” (p. 44), Sheikh Jabour telling him “ma-tahafsh [ما تخافش], ‘don’t fear’” (p. 9), and a Tuareg as asking him “Hash-Hâlik [ايش حالك], ‘How do you do?’” (p. 93), among other examples. However, Richardson does quote a “Prophet of the Touaricks” as addressing him in Tamahaq; he “said in a kind tone, ‘Gheem [ɣaym],’ (sit down),” and later “Yâkob, inker [Ya(ʕ)qub, ənkər], Arise, James.”²¹ Among themselves, the Tuareg inhabitants apparently spoke their own language in his presence; he quotes “the Giant Sheikh” addressing his subordinate “Enker, heek [ənkər hik], ‘Get up quick!’”²²

Knowledge of Hausa was evidently also widespread, though not universal. More than a century later, Adam found that 26% of his Ghat respondents reported speaking Hausa.²³ Of the imghad, Barth writes “many of the people, indeed, seem to be bilingual, but by far the greater part of the men do not even understand the Háusa language.”²⁴ One particular Hausa word seems to have been almost universally adopted:

There are certain foreign words which get currency, and supplant all native ones. This ‘bago’ is neither Touarghee, nor Ghadamsee, nor Arabic, although used by persons speaking almost exclusively these languages. Bago is Housa, as before mentioned [on p. 37].²⁵

20 Richardson, *Travels in the great desert of Sahara, in the years of 1845 and 1846*, vol. 2, 3

21 *ibid*, 46-47.

22 *ibid*, 216.

23 Adam, *A sociolinguistic investigation of language shift among Libyan Tuareg*, 151. See also Kohl, *Tuareg in Libyen. Identitäten zwischen Grenzen*, 208. Kohl notes that women in particular use Hausa, especially older women, but that it is not limited to them by any means.

24 Barth, *Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa*, 202.

25 Richardson, *Travels in the great desert of Sahara, in the years of 1845 and*

This explains an anecdote given by Barth, who notes that “Hatita told us expressly that, if any of the Imghad should trouble us, we should say ‘bábo.’ Now ‘bábo’ is neither Arabic nor Temáshight, but the Hausa word for ‘there is none.’”²⁶

Knowledge of European languages appears to have been essentially absent, filtering in sporadically from the coast. Richardson notes as a rare exception that “a son of the Governor recited to me the following famous distich, begging me to tell him what it meant: ‘Tummora, tummora, tera, Buon giorno, buona sera.’ On inquiring how he learnt it, he told me a Moor of Tripoli had taught him.”²⁷

2.1.2 Literacy

Literacy in Arabic seems to have been widespread, thanks to Qur’anic schools. Richardson notes that “In the streets, I pass nearly every evening a Night-School, where there is a crowd of children all cooped up together in a small room, humming, spouting, and screaming simultaneously their lessons of the Koran... It is probable that in this way, every male child of Ghat, as in Ghadames, is taught to read and write.”²⁸ The Governor’s daughters too learned to read, while for the literate, the abundant sand provided useful scratch paper.²⁹

These travellers do not mention the use of Tifinagh in the town of Ghat, although Richardson had (in Ghadames?) recorded a Tifinagh alphabet and a few examples of its use.³⁰ A generation or two later, the informants of Krause and Nehlil were both unable to write in Tifinagh, and Krause positively affirms that “this alphabet is foreign to the inhabitants of Ghat, who, if they write something, never use their

1846, vol. 2, 98.

26 Barth, *Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa*, 202.

27 Richardson, *Travels in the great desert of Sahara, in the years of 1845 and 1846*, vol. 2, 38.

28 *ibid*, 63.

29 *ibid*, 129, 65.

30 Richardson, *Touarick Alphabet, with the corresponding Arabic and English Letters*.

mother tongue, but rather always use Arabic.”³¹ However, rather closer to the date of Richardson’s stay, Freeman was able to learn Tifinagh, including the correct use of ligatures.³² It seems probable that his teacher had been his consultant, the former Qadi of Ghat. Freeman’s Tifinagh shows striking instances of Arabic influence, including the use of *tegherit* (the vowel dot) word-initially and the sporadic use of *shadda* and *fatha* over Tifinagh letters to indicate gemination and *â* respectively; the latter in particular seem likely to reflect his consultant’s fluent bilingualism. This suggests that Tifinagh was still part of the town’s orthographic repertoire in 1850, though perhaps already marginalized.

2.2 Text and Transcription

After the titles (Arabic then English), this manuscript is organised in three columns: English on the left, Tamahaq in the centre, and Arabic on the right. The Tamahaq text, written in a Maghribi hand presumably that of Muhammad Sharif, is carefully and consistently vocalized, marking gemination as well as vowel quality. The Arabic text, though written in the same hand, is not vocalized. Since the writing of Tuareg in Arabic script has been little studied, a brief overview is in order.³³

2.2.1 Vowels

In the Tamahaq phrases in general, stressed full vowels are transcribed as long, while other vowels are transcribed as short whether full or not. In principle this makes it possible to deduce the position of stress from the transcription in most, but not all, cases.

Mid vowels (*e*, *o*) are not orthographically distinguished from high vowels (*i*, *u*), as in Nehlil’s 1909 work. However, in other Tamahaq

31 “Dieses Alphabet ist den Bewohnern Ghats fremd, die sich überhaupt nie ihrer Muttersprache bedienen, wenn sie etwas schreiben, sondern stets der arabischen,” Krause, *Proben der Sprache von Ghat*, 30, 23. See also Nehlil, *Etudes sur le dialecte de Ghat*, 2.

32 Freeman, *A Grammatical Sketch Of The Temahuq or Towarek Language*, 7-8.

33 For some notes on a modern writing practice see Kossmann & Elghamis, “Preliminary notes on Tuareg in Arabic script from Niger.”

varieties the distinction is known to be phonemic, and the transcriptions of Krause confirm their presence in Ghat.³⁴

Central vowels (ǎ, ə) are in general distinguished neither from each other nor from unstressed full vowels (a for both, i for ə); a *fatḥa* can thus in most positions correspond to any of ǎ, ə, a. The manuscript thus provides no direct evidence for a contrast between two central vowels. However, Prasse's data for Djanet confirm the presence of such a contrast, and indirect evidence for it may be present here, in that ə can be transcribed as <i> whereas ǎ usually cannot. Central vowels after the stressed syllable are occasionally reduced orthographically to zero (*sukūn*); it cannot be determined from written evidence alone whether this reflects real vowel loss or just lower perceptual prominence.

Despite the impossibility of deducing them from the Arabic transcription used, mid and central vowels have been very provisionally reconstructed here following Prasse for grammar, and drawing upon the dictionaries of Prasse, Alojaly and Mohamed, Heath, and Foucauld for lexicon.³⁵ This should be taken as merely a practical measure to make this easier for Tuareg specialists to read, a sort of standardized spelling, and no weight should be placed on the choice of vowels in such cases.

2.2.2 Consonants

Regarding the consonants, geminates are often, but not always, marked with *shadda*. The non-Classical combination of *shadda* with *sukūn* is also used for word-final geminates followed by a vowel in a different word, as in no. 20, or for geminates followed by a post-stress central vowel orthographically reduced to zero, as in no. 239. It sometimes even appears for phrase-final consonants not expected to show any gemination, as in no. 131, perhaps for prosodic reasons.

In accordance with attested Tuareg Ajami practice further south,

34 Prasse, "New Light on the Origin of the Tuareg Vowels E and O."

35 Prasse, *Tuareg Elementary Course (Tahāggart)*; Prasse, Alojaly, and Mohamed, *Lexique Touareg-Français*; Heath, *Dictionnaire Touareg du Mali: tamachek-anglais-français*; Foucauld, *Dictionnaire Touareg-Français: dialecte de l'Ahaggar*.

the writer distinguishes plosive ض *ḍ* from fricative ظ *ẓ*.³⁶ For *z*, he almost always uses *j* <*z*>, unlike Krause's source, who prefers *ṣ* <*d*>. The only non-Classical letter employed is a *kāf* with three dots underneath ڨ, for *g*; other sounds absent from Arabic are not distinguished from their closest Arabic counterparts.

The relatively rare sound *ŋ*, only attested here in the words *asəŋgi* 'cooking' and *təŋgat* 'cooked (f.sg.)', is written by means of <*ny*>. Although Nehlil similarly just transcribes this as <*nr*>, there is reason to believe that its pronunciation was distinct in Ghat: Freeman transcribes 'cooking' as <*ásiŋgi*>, contrasting with forms like <*isinyal*> 'to plough'. The even rarer palatal nasal *ɲ*, whose presence in *zəɲh* 'sell' is suggested by Freeman's <*izieyha*> ɔʒʒiɔ 'he sold', is just written as <*n*>.

Affricates are not distinguished from the corresponding fricatives. The rare phoneme *č*, in the verb *áčč* 'eat' (different from Tahagart and Djanet *ăkš*, but see Nehlil's <*etch*>, Freeman <*itše*> ɔtʃɔ), is simply written <*š*>. In most cases, comparative evidence shows that <*ğ*> indicates *ğ* (perhaps a palatal—for Djanet, Prasse records [j])—rather than a true affricate, but it must be assumed that <*ğ*> can also indicate *ž*. Since the dominant Libyan Arabic reflex of this phoneme is /ʒ/, it probably usually indicates the latter in Arabic loans.

The Arabic sounds *ʕ* and *ħ*, which do not normally occur in Tamahaq, are adapted into the language as *y* and *x*, respectively, and written with the corresponding Arabic letters, for example: *ălxărir* for *al-ħarir* 'silk' and *ăžyăl* 'wish' from *ğasala* 'make, put' (dialectally in some regions 'think', as in Siwi), *ălyafiyăt* from *al-ʕāfiyah* 'good health', and even *Băylăbăk* for Baalbek (*Baʕlabakk*), a proper noun unlikely to have ever been used before in Ghat. In this respect, the dialect of this manuscript contrasts with that recorded by Nehlil, whose consultant (resident in Tunisia) frequently used pharyngeals in Arabic loanwords such as <*eçlah*> 'well-being', <*aberrah*> 'town crier', <*elâafiet*> 'health', while preserving the strategy of adaptation in (presumably) older loans such as <*elr'ar*> 'shame', <*takhaouit*> 'camel saddle'. Even in this manuscript pharyngeals are occasionally retained, at least orthographically, in what were probably nonce loanwords, such as *taʕibranit* 'Hebrew'.

Certain consonants are sometimes difficult to tell apart in the

36 Kossmann & Elghamis, "Preliminary Notes on Tuareg in Arabic script from Niger."

author's handwriting, notably: <q> and <ɣ>; <ɖ> and <x>; <m> and <ʃ>. Apparent instances of <q> for expected ɣ are thus more likely to be reading errors than genuine dialect differences, although *qq* is of course the geminate counterpart of ɣ in Tuareg generally.

19

2.2.3 Phonotactics

The cluster *zd productively becomes zz, as in 'purify' (impf. *zazzăġ* <zazġ> no. 274, contrasting with non-geminate *hăddiġăn* <haddiġan> 'pure' no. 222). 'Mosques' (*təmăzdiġawen* <tamazdiġawīn> no. 266) is an exception.

A number of clusters whose second element is *t* typically become voiceless geminates at the same place of articulation as the first element, as generally in Tuareg. This is productively seen for *k+t* in *e-hak-kăt năkra* <iḥakat nakra> 'we will rent it to you' (no. 140).

More unusually for Tuareg, *n+d* seems to assimilate to *dd* in one instance, unless this is just the accidental omission of a letter: *si-wəy-tăd-d* <sīwaytad> 'have them brought (hither)' (no. 91) for expected *siwəy-tăn-d. This does not appear to be systematic, as illustrated by forms like *hund* <hünd> 'like' (no. 144).

Uvular fricatives seem to induce lowering of an adjacent *i* to <a> (perhaps [ɛ]?), as observed in nos. 77 (*iyla* <aɣlā> 'it is expensive') and 82 (*ley ikătabăn* <līy akataban> 'I have letters').

Uvulars seem to induce emphasis loss in nearby consonants by long-distance dissimilation, at least in Arabic loanwords: thus *ăssax* <alssax> 'main thing' from *aş-şahḥ*, *ăttabăy* <ăttabăy> 'printing-press' (no. 246), from *al-ṭābiʿ*, and *ăxīsyăt* <raxīsyat> 'it is cheap' (no. 89), based on Arabic *raxīṣ*. This phenomenon is well-attested in Arabic dialects, and in Arabic loans into Siwi Berber further east.³⁷ Its extension to originally pharyngeal consonants, however, suggests that it must have been active within Ghat as well.

2.3 Sociolinguistic variation in Ghat Tamahaq

Comparison with other available sources reveals a number of differences in pronunciation, attesting to variation within Ghat Tamahaq. In

37 Souag, *Berber and Arabic in Siwa (Egypt): A Study in Linguistic Contact*, 37.

general, Richardson's materials align with Freeman's, matching Ahaggar Tuareg in some sociolinguistic variables (as already noted by Nehlil for Freeman), while Krause's are closer to Nehlil's (and Prasse's). These differences cannot be explained definitively with the limited data available. However, Richardson's and Freeman's consultants share a status not known to be shared by the others: both were trained religious scholars. The former is moreover reported to have had ancestors from the Tuat region, as discussed above, where Ahaggar Tuareg would certainly have been the locally best-known Tuareg variety. One might therefore speculate that this Ahaggar-like dialect was characteristic of an elite social network in Ghat centered on the originally Tuati family of the amānokāl of the time, perhaps associated with religious scholarship, or perhaps—as the title of the phrasebook would suggest—emphasising ties to a particular nomadic group such as the Iwraghen; according to Prasse, the nomadic dialects of the Ajjer group with Tahaggart Tamahaq against those of Ghat and Djanet.³⁸ Conversely, the other sources reflect a dialect sharing important sociolinguistic variables with Niger Tamajeq, sometimes probably as local archaisms but likely at least reinforced by contact with long-distance traders from the south. But more data is needed.

This 19th-century variation, with some traits seeming more Tamajeq-like and others more Tamahaq-like, reflects a complex linguistic situation which is continued in today's Ghat: Tamajeq has long been spoken in Ghat due to the city's importance for long-distance trade involving Tamajeq speakers, with a more recent influx of speakers in past decades due to the previous regime's openness to Nigerien Tuareg settling in Libya. Meanwhile, even Arabic speakers who were involved with trade in Niger sometimes adopted Tamajeq.³⁹

The most important variables are discussed in the following eleven sections.

2.3.1 *z > h vs. ʒ

The reflexes of proto-Berber *z are a well-known point of variation with-

38 Prasse, *Manuel de grammaire touaregue (tahāggart) I-III, Phonétique - Ecriture - Pronom*, 11.

39 Thanks to Ines Kohl (p.c.) for this additional information.

in Tuareg.⁴⁰ The name of the language (< *ta-maziḡ-t) makes a handy shibboleth: Tamahaq in the north (*z > h), Tamasheq in the southwest (*z > š), Tamajeq in the southeast (*z > ž / z). In Ghat, however, the reflexes show considerable dialect-internal variation: the language itself is called <Temahuq> by Freeman's consultant, but <temǎžeq> by Krause's and <tamadjek'> by Nehlil's. For Djanet, Prasse records both reflexes in different senses: *tǎmahǎq* (for the language) and *ǎmažǎḡ* 'homme de comportement noble, Touareg étranger (surtout du Niger ou du Mali)'. According to Adam, contemporary Ghat usage actually prefers the Arabic label "Targia" (تارقة, i.e. "Tuareg language"), writing that "'Tamaheq,' the term used in the literature for the Tuareg language, is not used or even known by many of the local people."⁴¹

Within this manuscript, the name of the language is not attested, but synchronic *h* ~ *ž* variation is found in the repeated term *ǎžyalǎḡ* ~ *ǎhyalǎḡ* 'I would like'. The former corresponds directly to the Arabic pronunciation, *ǧʕl* or (more likely in this region) *žʕl*, while the latter reflects the characteristic Tamahaq shift of *ž* > *h*. The fact that both are used by the same scribe indicates that we are dealing with a sociolinguistic variable within a single dialect, rather than with dialectal variation among speakers.

The accompanying vocabulary (not transcribed in this article) provides further evidence for the correspondence of *h* here and in Freeman to *ž* in later sources, and even in Arabic loans:

	ms.	Freeman	Krause	Nehlil	Prasse
'shop, house'	<taḡahāmt>	<táḡa-hamt>		—	taḡǎžamt
'answer' (Ar. <i>žāwab</i>)	—	<yehaḡab>		—	—
'donkey'	<īhīd>	—		<ijjidh>	ežed

40 Prasse, *loc. cit.*

41 Adam, *A sociolinguistic investigation of language shift among Libyan Tuareg*, 42.

2.3.2 *z > h (ms., Freeman) vs. z (Nehlil, Krause)

22

In many cases, *z is retained as z in Niger Tamajeq while still becoming *h* in Tahaggart Tamahaq. Ghat usually shows parallel variation in such cases, with *h* appearing in this manuscript and in Freeman where *z* appears in Krause, Nehlil, and Prasse; e.g.:

'sell'	<zanh>	<izieyha> oʒΣ:io	<zínz>	<zenz>	—
'day'	<ahal>	—	<ázəl> ǰsǎ	<azel>	azəl
'pure'	<hadīǵ>	<hedig> iʔT	—	<zeddidj>	zǎddiǵ
'blood'	—	<ehni>	—	<azeni>	—
'quickly'	<heek> (Richard- son's text)	<hie> (for *<hic>)		<zik>	—
'tall'	(vocab.) ihāǵrīn	ihégerin (alongside verbal noun: tezegerút †ʒTO†)		<zedjrin>	zǎǵrăt

The same difference is reflected with assimilation (and irregular—probably archaic—absence of the noun prefix) in:

'yesterday'	<anṭāhil>	—	—	<naz'z'el>	—
-------------	-----------	---	---	------------	---

In a few exceptional cases, however, even the earlier sources show *z*, sometimes in variation with *h*:

'figs'	<āzaran> / (vocab.) <āharan>	—	—	<azaren>	—
'difference(s)'	<izamzay>	<azímizi> 'distinguish'	—	—	—
'necessary' (<Ar.)	<ilzām>	—	—	<our i telzim>	—

The change *z > *h* did not affect geminate *zz* or *zd* (which usually assimilates to *zz*), as in 'inhabit' (impf. <tazāy> in this ms.) or 'purify' (<zazǵ>, contrasting with non-geminate <haddīǵ> 'pure') or 'short' (Freeman: <Gezúl> vs. non-geminate <tígheli> 'shortness').

This can only be interpreted as reflecting synchronic sociolinguistic variation. Ironically, the clear implication is that, in this re-

spect, later sources for Ghat represent more conservative varieties than the earliest ones.

2.3.3 *h involved/not involved in sibilant harmony

23

In Tuareg, as in many Berber varieties, sibilant harmony productively affects the causative prefix *s-*, which becomes *š/z/ž* if the root contains one of these sounds. There is no phonetic motivation for this process to involve *h*, and in most varieties it does not. However, phonologically regular application of the change *š > h* creates a morphologically irregular situation where some but not all *h*'s are involved in sibilant harmony. Treating *h* as a sibilant for harmony purposes allows this to be regularised, and the resulting change seems to be underway in 19th century Ghat.

In the causative 'make easy', Nehlil and Freeman's sources both voice the prefix, as though the *h* in the root derived from **z* (it does not, cf. Niger Tamajeq *inhal* 'be easy'), whereas this ms. leaves it unvoiced as historically expected:

'make easy'	<sanhal>	<yezinhel> ΣʒI:IH	<zenhel>
-------------	----------	----------------------	----------

With the Arabic loan 'prepare' (< *hayyi?*), this manuscript too voices the causative prefix, although the *h* is again original: <zahayyīd> and <zahīd> (i.e. *zāhayyi-d*).

2.3.4 *h > h (ms., Freeman) vs. Ø (Nehlil)

Proto-Tuareg **h* is often dropped by Nehlil's source, while surviving in this ms. and in Freeman, as in:

'house'	<īhan>	<éhen>	—	<ianan>	ehän, pl. ihănan 'ru- ral house' / yănan 'town house'
'chicken'	<tikahīt>	<écehi> 'a cock'	—	<tchikait>	ekăhi

In other cases, however, Nehlil too retains it:

'night'	<?ihaḍ>	<ahaḍ>	<éhad> اَهْط	<ihedh>	—
'strong (f.)'	<taṣṣūhīt>	<teṣúhat>	—	<teççohet>	—

Perhaps this reflects a change in progress taking off around the beginning of the 20th century. Prasse's remarkable gloss for 'houses' suggests that *h*-loss is synchronically associated with sedentary contexts today. Sedentary vs. nomadic origins might in turn correlate historically with class; Nehlil's consultant is the only one among the Ghat sources not to be a clearcut member of the town's elite.

2.3.5 *s > s (ms., Freeman) vs. š (Nehlil)

Nehlil's and Krause's sources tend to palatalise original *s, unlike Freeman's or this ms., but there is some variation within Nehlil.

'see'	<iswāḍ>	<isṣāḍ> ⁴²	—	<échouedh>	—
'change'	<maskal>	<amiscal>	—	<mechkel>	—
				<chechou-	
				ou>	but
'give drink'	<sasu>	—	—	<sesou>	—
				(‘arroser’)	
'when'	<as>	—	—	<as ~ ach>	—
'tribes'	<tiwsātīn>	—	<tši- uṣatšēn>	<tchiouch- atchin>	—

In most words, however, s and š seem to be consistent across sources:

'daughters'	<iši>	—	—	<ichchi>	əšš-e
'fire'	<tamsī>	<timesi>	—	<tchimsi>	temse

The observed distribution can clearly not be explained as a result of the sound change *si > ši, considered by Prasse (1972:11) as characteristic of southern Tuareg varieties. More or less variable palatalisation of sibilants is attested in Berber at least in Ouargla,⁴³ and in Arabic in many old urban varieties.⁴⁴ One might speculate that this became somehow emblematic of Ghat's urban identity.

42 Note that the originally Greek o-u ligature ϣ is used by Freeman for /w/.

43 See Delheure, “Grammaire de la teggargrent (berbère parlé à Ouargla)”, 48.

44 See Benkato, “Towards an account of historical new-dialect formation in northern Africa: The case of sibilant merging in Arabic dialects.”

2.3.6 *t > t vs. č (Krause, Nehlil)

Nehlil's source often palatalises *t to <tch>, as does Krause's (to <č>). Prasse notes that this palatalisation (to č' for him) was considered by his consultants as characteristic of Ghat, taking place before front vowels, and absent from Djanet. This change, however, is unlikely to be reflected in an Arabic transcription—and indeed is not reflected in Krause's, whose source in Arabic script writes <t>—so its absence from the ms. should not be taken as probative.

The change *ti > č'i is otherwise characteristic of Niger Tamajeq (with a further shift to š'i in Eastern Tawellemmet).⁴⁵ While affrication of t seems to recur across traditional urban varieties in Arabic and Berber (such as Figuig)⁴⁶ in the Sahara and North Africa, the reported distribution in Ghat matches better with Tamajeq, perhaps reflecting increasing influence from the south.

2.3.7 *g > g (ms.) vs. ġ (Nehlil)

Both this ms. and Nehlil reflect a split of *g into two synchronically distinct phonemes /g/ (<g> or <k>) and /ğ/ (a split not reflected in Freeman's transcription at all, where <g> ṭ appears in all contexts). The overwhelmingly predominant reflex in both is /ğ/, as generally in northern and western Tuareg but not in Niger.⁴⁷ However, in three of the five cases where <g> is written in this manuscript, it varies text-internally with <ğ>:

'numerous' (ptcp.)	<tagīt>	—	—	m. <(a)idjin>	igğāt 'it is ~'
'thank you'	<tanam- mīrt tagīt>	—	—	<tanem- mīrt enneḱ tedjdjit>	—
'action' (v.n. of 'do')	sg. <igī> pl. <ğītan>	<lge>	—	<idji>	—

45 Prasse, *loc. cit.*

46 Saa, *Quelques aspects de la morphologie et de la phonologie d'un parler amazighe de Figuig*, 66–69.

47 Prasse, *Manuel de grammaire touaregue (tahāggart) I-III*, 12.

'please'	3m.sg. <igrāḡ>	—	—	<edjrez>	—
	3f.sg. <tağrāḡ>				
'distance'	<īkiğji> <iğag>	<lgig>	—	<toudjedji>	—

In other cases, the manuscript retains /g/ (often written <k>) where Nehlil shows /ğ/:

'place'	<idak> / <adag>	—	—	<idedj>	—
'guard'	<ākaz>	<Yogaz>	—	<adjez>	agāz
'dinner'	<amagīn>	<Amagīni>	—	<amadjin>	—
'evening'	<tadakkat>	—	—	<tadedjat>	tadāggat (Chat: tadāğgāt)

In many cases, however, the two sources show the same distribution of reflexes:

'thousand'	<āğim>	<Agīm> oTĕ	—	<adjim>	—
'ask'	<yğmāy>	<lgmey>	—	<edjmi>	əğmi
'do, put'	<ağ>	<lga>	—	<edj>	—
'ceiling'	<dağā>	—	—	<tadadja>	—
'equal'	<yūkda>	<Yogda>	—	<iougda>	—

Idiolect-internal variation is evident not only in examples like 'please' and 'act' above, but also across derivations of the same verbal root, as may be seen by comparing 'do, put' to 'action'.

It is unclear what motivated the occasional retentions of *g*—evidently not phonetic context alone. Perhaps the change of **g* > *ğ* was not yet complete, or perhaps the use of *g* was another marker of scholarly status. One might even suspect that <*g*> was actually also pronounced as /ğ/; but that implausible hypothesis would simply leave us with a different case of sociolinguistic variation, in 'place' (<idak> / <adag>).

2.3.8 *d > d (ms.) or ğ (Nehlil) / _...ğ

This new phoneme /ğ/ seems to induce progressive long-distance assimilation of /d/ for Nehlil's source but not for our ms's writer:

‘mosques’	<tamazd- iḡawīn>	—	—	<tchimezd- jidjaouīn>	—
‘wet’	(vocab.) <ibdāḡ>	<Ibdag>	—	<ebdjedj> / <ebzedj>	abduḡ (n.)

2.3.9 Pharyngeals vs. uvulars

As discussed in 2.2.2, this manuscript almost always turns Arabic ʕ and ḥ into ɣ and x, as usual across Tuareg except in “maraboutic” tribes, whereas Nehlil’s source typically retains them. In many cases, the same word shows different forms in the different sources, implying variation at some point. As usual, Freeman’s source aligns with this ms, whereas Krause’s appears closer to Nehlil’s, showing retention at least of ḥ in forms like <žáha> ‘Juḥa’, <et’irham> ‘may He have mercy on him’.

‘health’	<alyāfiyat>	—	—	<elâafiet>	—
‘custom’	—	<Ilyáda>	—	<elâada>	—
‘silk’	<alxarīr>	—	—	<elh’arir’>	—
‘sorcerers’	<īmissaxx- aran>	—	—	<imes- souh’ar>	—
‘situation’	<alxāl>	—	—	<elh’al>	—

2.3.10 Uvular assimilation

In the dialect represented by this manuscript, unlike most Tuareg varieties, ɣ+k does not assimilate to qq, as shown by no. 14 (*əflasǎɣ-kǎɣ* <ʔaflasaykay> ‘I trust you’). This can hardly be a merely orthographic phenomenon, as the assimilation of k+t > kk is clearly transcribed, e.g. in no. 140 (*e-hak-kǎt nǎkra* <īhakat nakra> ‘we will rent it to you’). Contrast Krause (p. 40), with the expected assimilation: *ǎreq-qǎɣ* <areqaí> ‘I want you’.

2.3.11 Voiceless affricates

For ‘eat’, most Tuareg varieties have *ǎkš*, with irregular dissimilation of t > k, while most northern Berber varieties show *ǎčč*. (The original form may be reconstructed as *ǎtyəʔ, according to Kossmann.⁴⁸) Ghat

48 Kossmann, “Three irregular Berber verbs: ‘eat’, ‘drink’, ‘be cooked, ripen.’”

shows variation: the usual reflex in this ms. and in other sources for Ghat proper is *áčč*, but in the accompanying vocabulary (by the same consultant) we find <akš>, which is also what Prasse records for Djan-et.

'eat'	<aš> / (vocab.) <akš>	<itše> ⵓⵜⴰⵙⴰ —	<etch>	ākš
-------	-----------------------------	----------------	--------	-----

2.3.12 Vowel-zero alternations

This ms. has <naku> as well as <nak> for 'I', corresponding to Prasse's *nākk*, *nākku*, whereas Nehlil explicitly says that his source used <nek> and <nekkounan> but not <nekkou>. (Freeman only records <Nec>, and Krause <nak>, without commenting on other variant forms of the first person singular pronoun.)

A striking point of variation both within this manuscript and across the sources is the form of "I want": *ārey* <arīḡ>, the conservative form, is attested 9 times (nos. 33, 67, 85, 86, 133, 141, 225, 242, 243), but *rey* <rīḡ>, with the initial vowel dropped as in some northern Berber languages, occurs 10 times (nos. 44, 111, 122, 129, 150, 151, 210, 211, 212, 281). Freeman (p. 32), aligning as usual with Richardson, confirms the unexpected latter variant, giving <Reḡ> without the initial vowel. Later sources simply give the expected form with the initial vowel: Krause (p. 40) has <areḡai> 'I want you', Nehlil <arir'> 'I want' (p. 111), and Prasse *āreq-qān* 'I like them'. According to Prasse, Tahaggart too shows variation on this point.⁴⁹

2.4 Morphological traits of Ghat within Tuareg

2.4.1 Traces of the archaic future paradigm

Remarkably, Ghat appears to retain an archaic Berber trait preserved in Ghadames and Sokna but not yet described for any Tuareg variety: the absence of 1sg/2sg subject marking suffixes in certain classes of verbs in the aorist.⁵⁰ This is attested here in only three examples, involving

49 Prasse, *Tuareg Elementary Course*, 38.

50 See respectively Kossmann, "Le futur à Ghadamès et l'origine de la con-

two verbs: *ākn* ‘make, do well’ (no. 253, no. 15) and *māṇḍār* ‘return’ (no. 125).

In Ghadames, suffix omission applies throughout unless the verb’s aorist stem is monosyllabic, ends in *u*, or has the shape *iCi* or *əCCa/iD*. The distribution is probably somewhat different in Ghat: suffix omission is consistently not found with verbs from Prasse’s Conjugation I.A.1/2, such as *alməd* ‘learn’ (no. 44), *əktəb* ‘write’ (no. 33), *āqqəl* ‘arrive’ (no. 26), all of which should show suffix omission in Ghadames or Sokna. This difference in distribution makes a contact explanation in terms of influence from Ghadames appear unlikely.

The task of describing its distribution, however, is complicated not just by the paucity of examples but by evidence of variation. Verbs of Prasse’s Conjugation I.A.7 do not show consistent behaviour in this manuscript: *ākn* ‘make, do well’ (no. 253) displays suffix omission, but *ākḥ* ‘give’ (no. 72; cf. also Nehlil, p. 43) does not. (Neither does the one example of this class for which Freeman happens to provide a conjugation table: *āčč* ‘eat’.) The manner in which no. 15 was written provides a striking testimony to the “optionality” of suffix omission even for the same verb in the same phrase: the scribe evidently started by writing <ḡihatakṇ>, with a word-final <n> and no <d>, then changed his mind and tacked a rather puny <d> on to the tail of the <n>. Probably the analogical restoration of the suffix was already well under way, making suffix omission a marked optional choice, comparable to the use of the subjunctive in many varieties of English today. The limited size of the corpus makes it impossible to say much more, but clearly testing this should be a priority for any fieldwork on the variety of Ghat.

2.4.2 Irrealis/imperfective particles

In all Ghat sources the irrealis particle is *ed-* (here <id>), as in Tahaggart, rather than *ad-* as in most other Tuareg and Berber varieties. In extraction contexts, it is replaced with *ha-/he-* (in this ms. <ha> no. 15 / <hu ḡi>(!) no. 59), more or less matching Tahaggart *he* but contrasting with forms like *za/mad/mar* in most southern Tuareg varieties.

jugaison verbale en berbère,” and Souag, “Le parler berbère de Sokna à la lumière de nouvelles données.”

2.4.3 Quality verb markers

Ghat stands out within Tuareg as a whole for retaining the 3f.sg. quality verb suffix /-yāt/, spelled <-yat> in this ms. (no. 89 *rāxisyāt* ‘it is cheap’, based on Arabic *raxīṣ*) and <-iet> in Nehlil and Freeman.⁵¹ According to Kossmann, “The suffix /-yāt/ is not attested in dialects spoken outside Niger.”⁵² Its preservation in Ghat is another of the features of this dialect that recalls Niger Tamajeq, and distinguishes the dialect of this manuscript from Tahaggart.

2.4.4 Possessive pronouns

The 3sg. genitive marker in Ghat is *-annes* (<anīs> in no. 106, cf. Krause: <innēs>), whose *s* matches most Berber languages as well as Malian Tamasheq, but contrasts with Tahaggart and Niger Tamajeq *-annet*.

2.4.5 Interrogatives

The usual Tahaggart interrogatives *ma* ‘what?’ (no. 237), *mi* ‘who?’ (no. 270), *mani* ‘where?’ (no. 74), *emme* ‘when?’ (no. 104) are all well-attested in this manuscript (although *ma* usually occurs here in conventionalised combinations: *ma* + *umas* ‘be’ for ‘what?’, e.g. no. 220; *ma-d* + *ugdu* for ‘how much?’, e.g. no. 91)

Some forms, however, are less expected. Tahaggart uses *manek*-plus obligatory 3rd person object pronouns for ‘which is it?’, and unproductive *man-* for ‘which?’. The former is unattested in this manuscript; its closest match is a repeated form <minakīd>/<mānikīd> (probably to be reconstructed as *menakid/manekid*), rendering Arabic أين or فين ‘where?’, and explicitly translated as ‘where?’ in the vocabulary. As pointed out by Maarten Kossmann (p.c.), this might plausibly be derived from *manek-* ‘which one’ with a directional suffix *-id* ‘hither’. However, it occurs in contexts where a directional suffix appears synchronically impossible, so if this etymology is correct it must be a fos-

51 Nehlil, *Etudes sur le dialecte de Ghat*, 57; Freeman, *A Grammatical Sketch Of The Temahuq or Towarek Language*, 27.

52 Kossmann, *A Grammar of Ayer Tuareg* (Niger), 69. But note his comments on the difficulty of interpreting Nehlil’s data for this feature, Kossmann, “La flexion du prétérit d’état en berbère: questions de morphologie comparée,” 165 n. 19.

silised form. As such it appears to be unattested elsewhere in Tuareg.

Man-ăket for ‘how many?’ (followed by a noun in the construct state) is widespread in Tuareg, but in this ms. it is variously written <minakīt>/<mīnakīt>/<manakīt>, implying a pronunciation *men-ăket* distinct from that found elsewhere.

Two other interrogatives are found: *ənnəs* (no. 62, no. 239) and *ənnar* (no. 22) ‘which?’ The former seems to be rarely used across Tuareg, while the latter is reported by Prasse to be used by southern Tuareg (notably including Tamajeq) rather than by Tahaggart.⁵³

Polar interrogatives in this manuscript (yes-no questions) rather frequently use *mey* (otherwise ‘or’) as a sentence-final (occasionally sentence-initial) particle. This contrasts with Nehlil’s description, where sentence-final polar question tags are supposed to require a specified alternative: *mey kăla* ‘or not.’⁵⁴

2.4.6 Verbal nouns

This manuscript seems to show a certain predilection for verbal nouns with no noun class prefix: *musnăt* <musnat>/<mūsnat> ‘to know’, *medan* <mīdān> ‘counting, account’, *morăġăt* <mūraġat> ‘permission’, *ləmmudăt* <lumudat>/<lammudat> ‘to learn’. The latter two have not been observed in dictionaries examined. However, most verbal nouns here follow more widespread patterns.

2.5 Arabic dialectal differences and misunderstandings

In general, the translator seems to have understood the phrases reasonably well despite dialectal differences. However, some key grammatical elements of Levantine Arabic were evidently wholly unfamiliar in what would become southwestern Libya. The indicative imperfective *b-* of Levantine Arabic was consistently misinterpreted as the future/volitional *b-* of Libyan Arabic and thus translated with Tamahaq *ār* ‘want’, as for instance in no. 5 and in nos. 248 and 250 where Levantine *b-taʕrif* ‘do you know’ is rendered in Tamahaq as *tăred* ‘do you want to’.⁵⁵

53 Prasse, *Manuel de grammaire touaregue (tahăggart)* I-III, 220.

54 Nehlil, *Etudes sur le dialecte de Ghat*, 54.

55 On Libyan *b-* see Benmoftah & Pereira, “Les futurs en arabe de Tripoli

Similarly, the Levantine genitive particle *tabaʕ* was interpreted by the translator as a verb ‘follow’ (Tamahaq *əlkəm*) in no. 13. Conversely, in no. 144, Levantine *kēf* ‘how’ was understood as a preposition ‘like’, in accordance with Libyan usage.

Vocabulary differences, too, sometimes posed problems. An obscure word for ‘boat’, *šaxtūr*, was apparently sufficient to make the translator give up on no. 139 altogether. Eastern Arabic *khawāja* ‘gentleman, foreigner’ simply meant ‘rich man’ in Libya, and is rendered here as ‘one who has cattle/riches’ (nos. 27, 37). Or in no. 134, *hawwil hunā* (intended ‘alight here’) was understood as mentioning Libyan *hawli*, a traditional wool cloak, and rendered with Tamahaq *abrox ill-e* ‘the blanket is here’. Levantine *sakkir* ‘close’, though used in at least some parts of Libya, was read as *sukkar* ‘sugar’ in no. 184. In other cases, unknown Levantine place names were understood literally or reanalyzed, such as *ṭarīq mar sā(bā)* ‘the road of St. Sa(bba)’ rendered as *ābārāqqa (n) mārsa* ‘the harbor road’ and *bayt laḥm* ‘Bethlehem’ being rendered by *ayil wan san* ‘the direction of meat’ in no. 128.

Even valid Classical items could sometimes be unfamiliar to the translator. Weak roots seem to have been particularly likely to cause confusion, perhaps due to the morphological complications they pose to L2 speakers. For example, in no. 14, *mamnūn* ‘favoured’ seems to have been misunderstood as a derivative of *ʔmn* ‘be trustworthy’, thus yielding *əfləs* ‘trust’, rather than from *mnn* ‘to favour’. In no. 26, *taraġġā* ‘beg (a favour)’ seems to have been understood as a mispronunciation based on ‘return’ (*rġʕ*), and yielding Tamahaq *āqqəl* ‘return’. (As mentioned, neither the translator’s native Tamahaq nor the travellers’ native English and German included a phoneme ʕ, so the relevant forms may have been pronounced identically for them.) In no. 100, the imperative *haddi(?)* ‘calm, stop’ was misunderstood as the Libyan fem. demonstrative *hādī* ‘this’. In no. 155, *aḍi(?)* ‘to light’—which in Libya would normally have been expressed as *wallaʕ*—seems to have been read as a misspelling of its antonym *aṭfi(?)* ‘put out’ (recall that geminating *ḍ* yields *ṭṭ* in Tuareg).

3. Phrases

Label:	Dialogues in Arabic and the Aurâghee a Dialect of the Tuaregs - Ghat 24 July 1850. A
Arabic title:	هَذِهِ كَلَامُ الْعَرَبِيَّةِ مُتَرْجَمٌ بِاللُّغَةِ الْأَوْرَاغِيَّةِ 'This is Arabic speech translated into Awraghi Tuareg'
English title:	Short Dialogues in Arabic and in the Aurâghee-dialect of the Tuâregs

Each entry will be given here in the following format: the first three lines reproduce the source in the order English, Arabic, Tamahaq (plus transcription in < > brackets added by the editors); the next two lines give a reconstructed transcription based on later documentation of Tamahaq, followed only where necessary by a more literal translation. The sometimes idiosyncratic spelling or punctuation of English and Arabic text of the ms. has been reproduced exactly. If the entry in the ms. is written over multiple lines, a slash / indicates the line break.

<p. 1 = Kayat 1844, p. 20-21>

(Dialogue 1: Polite Conversation)

1. Good morning
صباح الخير
<mā tūla tufatannak>
Ma tola tufat-ənnāk? 'What is your morning like?'
2. Good evening
مساً الخير
<mā tūla tinisīnnak>
Ma tola tenäse-nnāk? 'What is your evening like?'
3. How do you do?
كيف حالك
<mād yūla ʔalxālannak>
Ma-d yola ālxal-ənnāk? 'With what is your situation like?'
4. Where are you going?
وين رايع
<mani 'stakīd>
Mani-s təkkeḍ? 'Where are you going towards?'
5. Do you travel alone?
انت بتسافر وحدك

- تَرِيدُ أَسِكَالَ يَاسَانَّاك <tarīd asikal yāsannak>
Tāred asikal yās-ənnāk? ‘Do you want to travel alone?’
6. very well
بالف خير (With a thousand goodnesses)
سَاجِم نَلْخِير <sāḡim nalxīr>
S āḡim n ālxe ‘With a thousand of goodness’
7. Thank you
كتر خيرك (Increase your goodness)
تَنَمِيرْت تَغِيْت <tanammīrt tgīt>
Tanəmmert tāggit (or: tāḡḡet). ‘Blessing has increased (or: plentiful blessing).’
8. Thank God
الحمد لله
أَجُودَا مَسِينَاي <aḡūḍa masīnay>
Āḡoḍa⁵⁶ Māss-ināy ‘Thank our Lord’
9. I hope you are quite well
ان شاء الله تكون مبسوط
إِنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ تَادِيوِد <in šāʾa ʾllāha tadīwid>
Inšaʾlla tāddiwed. ‘Inshallah you are glad.’
- <p. 2 = Kayat 1844, p. 21-23>
10. I am very well thank God
بالف خير لله الحمد (In a thousand goodnesses, thank God)
نَكُ سَاجِم نَلْخِير أَجُودَا يَالله <naku sāḡim nalxīr aḡūḍa yāllah>
Nāḡku s āḡim n ālxe āḡoḍa Yāʾlla ‘I am with a thousand of goodness, thank God’
11. I am very glad to see you arrived safe
لله الحمد على وصولك بالسلامه (Thank God for your arrival in safety)
نَجُحِي يَالله فُلُو السَّلَامَةِ نَكُ <naḡūḍiyy yāllah fulū ʾssalāmat nnak>
Nāḡoḍāy (i) Yāʾlla foll⁵⁷ āssālamāt-ənnāk ‘We thank God for your safety’

56 This is probably a noun, as in Arabic, corresponding to Mali Tamasheq *ājoda*; but on that analysis the absence of a dative preposition appears odd. Perhaps it should rather be analysed as an irregular Niger-like 1sg verbal form, as suggested by Maarten Kossmann.

57 The scribe seems likely to have transposed <l> and <w> here.

12. I hope you will not be long absent from us
 إِنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ مَا بَتَغِيبُ عَنَا كَثِيرٌ
 <?in šāʔa 'llāh warhīn iltakad ʔīkit>
 Inša||a wār-hin əttəkk(e)d eket 'Inshallah you are not going
 away for long.'
13. As it pleases God⁵⁸
 تَبَعَ تَسْهِيلِ الْبَارِي (Of God's making easy)
 <alkam yāwaday sanhal yāllah>
 Əlkəm y-awa da isanhal Yā||a 'Follow what God makes easy here'
14. I am very much obliged to you
 أَنَا كَثِيرٌ مَمْنُونُكَ
 <?aflāsaɣkay hūllan>
 Əflasəɣ-käy hullan. 'I trust you very much.'
15. Will you do me a favor?
 تَرِيدُ تَعْمَلُ مَعِيَ مَعْرُوفٌ
 <tarīd ʔīhataknaɗ ʔayulāūɣan>⁵⁹
 Tāred e ha-tāknāɗ a yolaɣān? 'Do you want to do something
 good?'
16. With great pleasure
 بِالرَّاسِ وَالْعَيْنِ (With head and eye)
 <fūl ʔaɣafīn ad tītīn>
 Foll əɣāf-in əd tetṭ-in 'On my head and my eye.'
17. You are welcome
 أَهْلًا وَسَهْلًا
 <?addiwīɣak hūllan>
 Əddiwey-ak hullan. 'I am very glad for you.'
18. I hope you are better
 إِنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ تَكُونُ أَحْسَنَ
 <?in šāʔa 'llāh ʔidtalɣad>
 Inša||a ed-taləɣāɗ 'Inshallah you will get better.'
19. Yes
 نَعَمْ

58 Skipped in ms.: Please God; Through God's favour.

59 The reading of this phrase presents some difficulties; the -d has been added after the n, and the middle of the last word seems to have been overwritten. The transcription of *yolaɣān* is also odd.

هُولَنَّ <hūllan>

Hullan. 'A lot.'

20. I have a letter of introduction to you

أنا معي كتاب توصي لك

إِوَايَعَكْ أَكْتَبَنَّكَ <iwāyaḡakadd akatabannak>

Ewayāḡ-ak-ədd akātab-ənnāk. 'I have brought you your writing.'

21. Welcome

مرحبا

مَرْخَبَا <marxabā>

Mārxāba 'Welcome'

22. When did you come?

ايمتا جيت

إِنَّرْ إِيْمِرْ أَشْشُسِيْدْ <ʔinnar ʔīmir ʔasatūsīd>

Ənnar emer as tosed? 'Which time did you come?'

23. Today.

اليوم

أَهْلَوَاءْ غْ <ʔahalwāday>

Ahāl wadāḡ 'Today'

24. Yesterday

امس

أَنْطَاهِلْ <ʔanṭāhil>

Ənṭ-ahāl 'Yesterday'

25. I hope you will tell me anything I can do for you.

بترجاك تقول لي كلام يلزمك (I beg of you to tell me a word you need)

إِيْهَكَ أَقْلَغْ تَنْدُتْفِيْرْ تَنْكَ <ʔīhak ʔaqqalay tanad tafirtannak>

E-hak āqqālāḡ tānnād tafert-ənnāk. 'I will return to you and you will say your word.'

<p. 3 = Kayat 1844, p. 23-26>

26. I beg you

بترجاك

إِيْهَكَ أَقْلَغْ مِيْغْ <ʔīhak aqalay mīḡ>

E-hak āqqālāḡ mey? 'Will I return to you?'

27. O Sir

يا خواجه

وَيْلَنْ إِيْهَرِيْ <waylan īharī>

Wa ylan ehäre 'One who owns cattle/wealth'

28. (English left blank in ms.)⁶⁰
يا سيد
وَيُوفَن <wayūfan>
Wa yufan 'Superior one'
29. Good bye
خاطرکم <your good pleasure>
سَلْخِيرْ يَا <salxīr yā>
S ālxeṛ ya 'With goodness'
30. With peace
مع السلامه
دَغِ السَّلَامَة <daya 'ssalāmat>
Dāḡ āssālamāt 'In safety'
31. We hope to see you again
ان شا الله نشوفك بحير (Inshallah we will see you in good health)
إِنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ إِدْتَمَنِّي سَالْخِير <?in šāʔa 'llāh idnamanay sālḡīr>
Inšallā ed-nāmmāñy s ālxeṛ. 'Inshallah we will see each other with goodness.'
32. Write to me when you arrive at Damascus
اكتب لي عند وصولك إلى الشام
أَكْتَبِيد دَغِ الشَّام <aktabīd day 'ššām>
Əktəb-i-d dāḡ Āššām. 'Write to me in the Levant.'
33. I certainly will write to you
أنا معلوم بكتب لك
أَرْبِغْ إِيهَكَ أَكْتَبْ <?arīḡ ?īhaka 'ktabay>
Āreḡ e-hak əktəbāḡ. 'I want to write to you.'
34. God bless you
الله يكون معك (God be with you)
تَدِيْوَدْ أَدْمَسِينْ <tadīwad ?admasīnay>
Tāddewād əd Mäss-ināḡ. 'You are with Our Lord.'

60 In Kayat this phrase follows the above with the note "to a Mohamedan Lord or Christian Bishop".

35. Do not take the trouble⁶¹
لا تكاف الخاطر (Do not recompense the good pleasure)
وَرَهْسَتِكِيدَ أَوَرِ إِيرِي <warhastikīd awar īrī>
Wār-has tægged a wār ire. 'Don't do to him what he doesn't want.'
36. It is great pleasure
حلت البركه (Blessing has opened)
تَلِّي الْبَرَكَه <tallī 'lbarakah>
Təll-e ālbārākāt. 'There is blessing.'
37. Give my compliments to Mr
سلم لي على الخواج
تَهُولَادِينَ وَيْلَنَ إِيَهَرِي <tahūladīn waylan īhārī>
Tāhulād-i-n wa ylan ehäre. 'You greeted for me the one who owns wealth/cattle.'
38. Certainly
معلوم
يَمُون <yamūn>
Yāmmun. 'It is obvious.'
39. Excuse me
لاتواخذني <don't chastise me>
وَرَهْتَرْمِسِيدَ سِيكِيَهِن <warhitarmisayd⁶² sigihin>
Wār-hi tärmesād s igi-hin. 'Don't hold me for my act.'
40. Do not mention it
فاشاك من المواخذة (Far be you from chastisement)
وَرَجِيغَ كَيِّ وَايَرْمَسَنَ سِيكِيَهِن <warġīḡ kay wāyrmasan sīkiġi>
Wārġeḡ kāy wa yārmāsān s igeġi. 'It's not you that holds (is held?⁶³) from a distance.'
41. God grant that we may see you well and in good health
اللّٰهُ يَرِينَا وَجْهَكَ بِخَيْرٍ وَعَافٍ (God show us your face in goodness and health)
إِهْنَعْ تَسْمِنْدَكَ مَسِينَعْ سَالْغَافِيَه <?ihanaḡ yasmanidak masīnaḡ sālyāfi-

61 In Kayat, the Arabic is misprinted as لا تكاف الخاطر, no doubt leading to further misunderstanding in the Tamahaq translation.

62 Probably with accidental transposition of <y> and <s>.

63 The phrase would seem to make more sense if the verb is assumed to be labile.

yat>

E-hanāḡ yəsmənəy d-ək Mäss-ināḡ s ālyafiyāt. 'May our Lord cause us to meet up with you in good health.'

(Dialogue 2: Discourse with an Interpreter)

42. Do you speak English?
 بتعرف انكليزي (Do you know English?)
 <tarīd musnat antakilizit>
 Tāred musnāt ən Tākəlizit⁶⁴? 'Do you want to know English?'
 <p. 4 = Kayat 1844, p. 26-28>
43. French or Italian
 فرنساوي واطلياني (French and Italian)
 <ʔafrānsī 'ṭṭalyānī>
 Afransi əd⁶⁵ Ṭālyani 'French and Italian'
44. I speak English
 انا بعرف انكليز (I know England)
 ريغ إدلمدغ أنكيليز <rīḡ ʔidalmaday ankilīz>
 Reḡ ed-əlmədāy Ənkəlīz. 'I want to learn England.'
45. I want to travel into the country
 انا بدي اسافر في البلاد
 أهغالغ آسيكل <aḡyālāy⁶⁶ asīkal>
 Āḡyālāy asikəl. 'I would like to travel.'
46. Do you know the different parts of the country
 انا بتعرف نواحي البلد
 أهغالغ مُسنت أنسقلّي نكال <aḡyālāy musnat an saqlay n akāl>
 Āḡyālāy musnāt ən səqlay n ākal. 'I would like to know the surroundings of the country.'

64 The first and second vowels of 'England' and 'English' are assumed to be ə, since they vary between <i> and <a> in this manuscript.

65 The assimilation of *d* to the following *ṭ* is not transcribed here.

66 The third character here could be غ or خ; the reading assumes that this is a variant of the same originally Arabic verb given as *əḡyāl* further on, as discussed in section 2.3.

47. Have you ever travelled⁶⁷ with any traveller before.
 انت سافرت مع غير سراح⁶⁸
 <tasūkalad walā amaḍin watlīd>
 Tāssokālād wālā amaḍin⁶⁹ wa tāled? 'Did you travel without the
 herd/grazing you have?'
48. Have you certificates of character.
 عندك اوراق شهادت
 <allānat ḡurak tirwīn 'ntuḡuhāwīn>
 Əllanāt ḡor-ək terawen⁷⁰ ən təḡuhawen? 'Do you have letters of
 attestation?'
49. What countryman are you?
 انت من اي بلد (Which country are you from?)
 <mā yamūs ?akālannak>
 Ma yāmos ākal-ənnāk? 'What is your country?'
50. Can you teach the language?
 انت بتحسن تعلم اللغة
 <tarīd musnat nalūḡa>
 Tāred musnāt n ālluḡa? 'Do you want to learn the language?'
51. How old are you?
 قدر ايش عمرك
 <mādyūkdāḡamarannak>
 Ma-d yogda āḡāmār-ənnāk? 'What is your age equal to?'
52. What language do you speak best.
 اي لغة بتعرف احسن
 <mā yamūs ?awāl watasanad hūll_n>
 Ma yāmos awal wa tāsānād hullan? 'What is the language that
 you know a lot?'
53. Do you speak Turkish?
 بتعرف تركي

67 In Kayat: Did you ever travel...

68 Kayat has سواح 'tourists', miscopied in the ms. as سراح 'grazing'.

69 Not found in dictionaries examined, but evidently matches in meaning and form with the attested corresponding feminine form *tamaḍint*.

70 This appears to be a cross-dialectally unusual plural form.

- تَرِيد لُمُدَات أَن تَتُرْكِيَت <tarīd lumudāt an taturkīt>
Tāred ləmmudāt⁷¹ ən tāturkit? ‘Do you want to learn Turkish?’
54. Do you know Hebrew?
بَتَعْرِف عِبْرَانِي <tarīd lumudāt an taṣībranīt>
Tāred ləmmudāt ən tāṣībranit? ‘Do you want to learn Hebrew?’
55. Do you know any Persian?
بَتَعْرِف فَارِسِي <tarīd lumudāt an talfārsīt>
Tāred ləmmudāt ən tālfarsit? ‘Do you want to learn Persian?’
56. Do you know the grammar?
بَتَعْرِف نَحْو وَصَرَف (Do you know grammar and morphology?)
تَرِيد لُمُدَات نَا النَّحْوِ الصَّرَف <tarīd lumudāt nannaḥwid’ṣṣarfa>
Tāred ləmmudāt n ānnāḥw əd āṣṣārf a? ‘Do you want to learn the grammar and morphology?’
57. Where did you learn?
فِين تَعْلَمْت (Where did you/she learn?)
مَانِي دَاتْلَمَد <mānid ‘ttalamad>
Mani-d-āt təlmād? ‘Where did she learn it?’
58. Is your father living?
أَبُوك طَيِّب (Your father is good)
تِيكَ يَظِيد <tīk yaẓīd>
Ti-k yaẓed. ‘Your father is agreeable.’
59. I will engage you.
⁷²أَنَا بَاخْدَمَن (I shall work / I will serve us / I will make us work)⁷³
نَاك مِيَهْ إِيخْدَمَغ <nak mīh<u>⁷⁴ ?ixdamay>
Nāk mi he-xdəmāḡ? ‘Me, whom shall I serve?’

<p. 6 = Kayat 1844, p. 28-31>

71 This verbal noun is not attested in other dialects examined, so the vowel quality is somewhat conjectural.

72 Miscopying of ن for Kayat’s ك, producing a form that is difficult to parse.

73 The messy Arabic was interpreted as if it had a shadda and a missing space: *baxdim-man*.

74 While this looks like quite a clear *ḍamma*, we seem obliged to interpret it as an incomplete *sukūn*.

60. What do you expect a month?

قدر ايش بذك بالشهر

مِينَكِت تَرِيد نَاك تَالِيَت <minakīt tarīd nāk tālīt>

Men-āket tāred nak tallit? 'How much do you want for each month?'

61. Come to me tomorrow morning.

تعالى لعند بكرة على بكر

تَنْهِيَادِيد نَاك تُوفَت <tanhiyadīd nāk tūfat>

Tāñhəyād-i-d nak tufat. 'You should come early to me every morning.'

(Dialogue 3: Discourse with a Servant)

62. What is your name

ايش اسمك

أَنَسْ إِسْمَنَّكَ <annas isamannak>

Ənnəs esəm-ənnāk?

63. Peter tell me if you can cook?

يا بطرس قل لي ان كان بتعرف تطبخ

هِي بَطْرَس تَسَانَدَ أَسَنْغِي <hiy baṭras tasānad asanḡi>

Hey Bāṭras təssanād asənḡi? 'Hey Boutros, do you know cooking?'

64. Have you ever travelled with English travellers?

سافرت ابدًا مع حوارة انكليز

تَسُوْكَلْ د تَرْتَايَدِ اُمَيَوَيْن تَنْكَلِيَز <tasūkal_d tartāyad 'dmayawayn nankalīz>

Tāssokālād tārtayād əd mǎyyāwānān⁷⁵ n Ənkəliz? 'Have you travelled mixing with rich people from England?'

65. Have you any certificates?

عندك اوراق

تَلِيدِ اِكْتَبَن مِيْغ <talīd ikataban mīḡ>

Tāled ikātabān meḡ? 'Do you have any writings?'

66. Do you know their names?

بتعرف اسميهم

تَسَانَدِ إِسْمَوْنَسَن <tasānad ismawanasan>

Təssanād esmawān-nāsān?

75 We assume the last <y> of this word was written as a mistake for <n>.

67. I want to go to Jerusalem, Damascus, Baalbec and to all parts of Syria.
 انا بدّي اسافر على القدس والشام وبعلبك وكل بر الشام
 <naka rīḡ tikawta
 na'lššām da'lquds adkallan na'lššām amdan>
 Nāk āreḡ tikawt n Āššām d Ālquds əd kallān n Āššām əmdan. 'I want to go to the Levant and Jerusalem and all the lands of the Levant.'
68. Do you know the roads?
 بتعرف الطرقات
 <tasānad ibardān>
 Təssanād ibərdan?
69. Do you know the best muleteers?
 بتعرف المكاربه الملاح
 <tasānad imakāriyyan>
 Təssanād imākariyyān? 'Do you know muleteers?'
70. What are your wages?
 قدر ايش اجرک
 <mād yūkda alkarannak>
 Ma-d yogda ālkāra-nnāk? 'What is your wage equal to?'
71. I take you by the month.
 انا باخذك مشاهرة
 <ihīdākād nāk tālīt>
 E-hi-d ttakkād nak tallit. 'You will be going to me every month.'
72. I will pay you a month in advance.
 انا بدفع لك اجرة شهر سلف
 <ikayy akfaḡ alkarā tālīt asārḡāl>
 E-kāy ākfāḡ ālkāra tallit asārḡal. 'I will give you wages a month in advance.'
73. Do you know of any inns here?
 بتعرف البارجات هون
 <tāssanad alfūndaq dīday mīḡ>
 Təssanād ālfundāq dedāḡ meḡ? 'Do you know a hotel here?'
74. Which is the best?
 اين هي الاحسن
 <mānitātūfat>
 Mani ta tufāt? 'Where is the best one?'

75. I want to hire a house.
 انا بدي استاجر بيت
 أَجْعَالُغْ إِدَاكَرَغْ إِيْهَنْ <ʔajɣālay idakray ʔiħan>
 Əʒɣaləɣ⁷⁶ ed-əkrəɣ ehən. 'I would like to rent a house.'
76. How much does he ask
 قدر ايش بيطلب
 مَا دِيُوكْدَا ʔَاوَا يَغْمَاي <mādyūkda ʔawā yğmāy>
 Ma-d yogda awa yəğmay? 'What is what he asks for equal to?'
- <p. 5 = Kayat 1844, p. 31-34>
77. It is very dear.
 غَالِي كَثِير
 أَغْلَا هُولَنْ <aylā hūllan>
 lyla hullan. 'It is very expensive.'
78. I want it cheap.
 انا بدي اياه رخيص
 إِكْرَاظِ إِنْنِي رَخِيص <igrāzi ʔinnīn raxīṣ>
 lgrāz-i innīn rāxiṣ. 'It pleases me that it is cheap.'
79. I give you twenty dollars a month
 انا بعطيك عشرين ريال بالشهر
 إِهَكْ أَجْغْ سَتَمَرَوِين تَرْيَالِ إْتَلْت <iħak ajaɣ sanatamarwīn nariyyāl itallit>
 E-hak əğəɣ sānat təmārwen n əriyyal⁷⁷ i təllit. 'I will put for you twenty riyals a month.'
80. Call me a good muleteer here
 جيب لي مكارى مليم لهون
 سِيْسِيْدَ آمَكَارِي يُولَاغَنْ <sīsīd amakārī yūlāɣan>
 Sis-i-d amākari yolaɣän. 'Bring me a good muleteer.'
81. Come to me in the evening
 تعالي لعند بالمسا
 آسِيْدَ خُورِ إِهَضْ وَادَغ <asid xūri iħaɖ wāɖaɣ>

76 This verb, unattested in Tuareg dictionaries examined, seems to express volition. It is presumably a borrowing of Arabic جعل, which in Siwi would mean "think, believe". For an apparent variant with *h*, see above.

77 Probably not the same vowels as Niger *arrayal* (pointed out by Maarten Kossmann); cf. Freeman's *areyalen*, which also shows no gemination of the *r*.

As-əd ɣor-i ehəḍ wadäɣ. 'Come to my place tonight.'

82. Go and see if I have any letters at the post office
 روح شوف ان كان لي مكاتب في البوسطا
 <sīkal asann kud līɣ akataban
 day 'lbūstā>
 Sīkal əssən kud lēɣ ikātabān dəɣ əlbostā. 'Go find out if I have
 letters at the post office.'

83. Show me the house of the Consul
 فرجيني بيت القنسل
 <saknīd īhan nalqunṣul>
 Səkn-i-d ehān n əlqunṣul. 'Show me the house of the consul.'

(Dialogue 4: Discourses with a Merchant)

84. Have you any Damascus silk?
 عندك قماش شامي (Do you have Levantine cloth?)
 <talā ɣūrak tabūrit nālššām>
 Təlla ɣor-ək taborit n Əššām? 'Do you have a piece of cloth of
 the Levant?'
85. I want some new pattern.
 انا بدني قسمه جديد
 <?arīɣ tafūlta taynāyat>
 Āreɣ tafult təynayāt. 'I want a new portion.'
86. I want two pieces alike.
 انا بدني طرفتين من فرد شكل
 <?arīɣ asīn haratan ?ulānīn>
 Āreɣ əssin hərātān olanen. 'I want two things the same.'
87. How much a piece?
 بكام الثوب (How much is the robe?)
 <mīnakīt tikamīst>
 Men-əkət tekāməst? 'How much is the robe?'
88. It is dear.
 غالي
 <taɣlā>
 Tāɣla. 'It is expensive.'
89. It is cheap.
 رخيص <sic>
 <raxīsyat>
 rāxisyāt.

90. I give you 100 piastres.
 انا بعطيك مائة غرش
 اِكَيَكْفَغ دَس تِيْمِيضْ تَلْكَرَشْ <ikayakfay das tīmiḍi nalkaraš>
 E-kāy ākfāy d-əs temeḍe n ālgārəš. 'I will give you for it 100 qirsh.'
91. Send them to me to the inn of Joseph.
 ابعث لي اياهم بارجة يوسف
 سِيْوَيْتَد دَغ آرَجَة اَن يُوسُف <sīwaytad day arġat 'n yūsuf>
 Siwəy-təd⁷⁸ -d dāy ārġāt⁷⁹ ən Yūsəf. 'Have them brought to the inn of Yusuf.'
92. How much is your account?
 كام حسابك
 مَاد يُوَكْدَ مِيْحَانَّكَ <mād yūkda mīḍānnak>
 Ma-d yogda meḍan-ənnāk? 'How much is your account equal to?'
- (Dialogue 5: Discourse with a Muleteer or Camel Driver)
93. Have you good mules?
 عندك بغال املاح
 تَلِيدَ اَلْبَغْلَة تُولَايَة <talīd albaylat tūlāyat>
 Tāled ālbāylāt tolayāt? 'Do you have a good she-mule?'
- <p. 8 = Kayat 1844, p. 34-37>
94. We prefer horses
 نحن نرغب خيل احسن
 اَسُوْفَغْ اَيَّيس <asūfay āyyis>
 Āssofāy ayəs. 'I prefer a horse.'
95. We have our own saddles
 نحن عندنا سروجتنا
 نَلِين اِلْكَفَنَّاغ <nālīn ilakfannanay>
 Nəl-en ilakfan nānāy. 'We have them, our saddles.'
96. I want a strong mule for our tent and kitchen
 انا بدي بغل قادر من شان الخيمي والزواة
 اَجْجَالَاغْ اَلْبَغْلَة تَصُوْهِيَة فُوْل تَغِيَامْت دَ الزَّاء <ağjālay albaylat taṣṣūhīt
 fūl taxyāmt d azzād>

78 This seems to show assimilation of *n-d* > *dd*.

79 Presumably a nonce loanword from Arabic.

Əžxalāx ālbāylāt tāssohet foll tāxyamt d āzzad. 'I would like a mule strong enough for the tent and provisions.'

97. How much do you charge per day for each mule?
 كام كرى البغل بالنها
 <mād yūkda 'lkara nalbaɣlat>
 Ma-d yogda ālkāra n ālbāylāt? 'What is the hire of the mule equal to?'
98. How many days will it take us to Baalbec?
 كام يوم الى بعلبك
 <manakīt haḍān baɣlabaka>
 Man-āket hāḍan Bāylābāk a? 'How many nights is Baalbek?'
99. Do you know the roads well?
 انت بتعرف الطرقات جيب
 <tasānad abaraqqa hūllan>
 Təssanād abarāqqa hullan? 'Do you know the road a lot?'
100. Stop the mules.
 هدي البغال (Calm the mules)
 <?awwa talbaɣlata>
 Awa talbāylāt a. 'This is the she-mule.'
101. This horse is lame.
 هادا الحصان يعرج
 <?awa ?āyyis>
 Awa ayəs. 'This is a horse.'
102. The mule lost his shoe.
 البغل وقعت نعلته
 <tasssalt nalbaɣlat tartak>
 Tasəsəlt n ālbāylāt tārtāk. 'The mule's shoe fell.'
103. Change me this horse.
 غيرلي هادا الحصان
 <maskalīd ?āyyis>
 Māskāl-i-d ayəs. 'Change me the horse.'
104. When shall we arrive?
 ايمتى نصل
 <?ammihinawad>
 Əmme e-hin nawād? 'When will we arrive?'
105. Is the caravansary far?
 الخان بعيد
 <alxān yūğgiğ>

Ālxan yoğāğ? 'Is the caravanserai far?'

106. How far?

قَدَّرْ اَيْشْ بَعِيدْ

مَادْ يُوكَدْ إِجْجَنِيَسْ <mād yūkda ?iğāğānīs>

Ma-d yogda iğāğ-əñnes? 'What is its distance equal to?'

107. Which is the road?

اَيْنْ هُوَ الدَّرْبْ

الدَّرْبْ مَانِكِيدْ <'lddarb mānikīd>

Āddārb manekid? 'Where is the road?'

108. Wait for me.

اصْبِرْ لِي

ظِدْرِي <ẓidrī>

Ẓāydār-i 'Wait for me.'

109. Drive on.

سُوقْ

السُّوكْ <assūk>

Āssuk 'Market'

110. Slowly

عَلَى مَهْلَكْ

فُولْ مَانَّكْ <fūl mānnak>

Foll man-nnāk 'On your self'

<p. 7 = Kayat 1844, p. 37-39>

111. I want water to drink

بَدِي اشْرَبْ

رَبْغْ تَيْسَسِي <rīḡ tīsasī>

Rēḡ tesāse. 'I want to drink.'

112. Give the horses water

اسْقَى الْخَيْلْ

سَسْ إِيَّسَانْ <sasu iyyasān>

Sāsaw ayyāsan. 'Make the horses drink.'

113. Where shall we alight?

وَيْنْ مَنَحُولْ

مَنْي نَوَاضْ <manī niwāḍ>

Mani newâḍ? 'Where have we arrived?'

114. Which is the convent?

اَيْنْ هُوَ الدَّيْرْ

مَنْكِيدْ الدَّيْرْ <minakīd addīr>

Menakid ādder? ‘Which is the monastery?’

115. We like to pitch our tent near the water.

نريد نصب الخيمة قرب مويه
 <nara idnakras taxyamt>
 Nāra ed-nākrās taxyamt. ‘We want to pitch the tent.’

116. We do not travel in the heat of the day.

نحن ما نريد نساfer في جرا النهار
 <warnarī asīkal dāḡ tuksī nahal>
 Wār nāre asikāl dāḡ tukse n āhāl. ‘We do not want to travel in the heat of the day.’

117. Do you know the chief of this village?

بتعرف اسم شيخ البلاد
 <tasānad isam namḡar nakal>
 Tāssanād esām n āmḡar n ākal? ‘Do you know the name of the chief of the country?’

118. What horsemen are there before us?

ما هم الخياله قدامنا
 <māyamūs awīn dātnaḡ>
 Ma yāmos awen dat-nāḡ? ‘What are those who are before us?’

119. Ask him the name of this place

اساله اسم هل مكان
 <isam nadak wāday>
 Esām n-ādāḡ wadāḡ ‘The name of this place’

(Dialogue 6: Discourse with a Camel Driver)

120. O Camel Driver! Have you a good dromedary?

يا جمال عندك هجين مليح
 <īwārnnamnas talīd taḡlāmt tulāḡat>
 E ywarān n⁸⁰ amnas tāled taḡlāmt tolaḡāt? ‘You who are on camels, do you have a good she-camel?’

121. Have you good camels?

عند جمال طيبه (At good camels)

80 A genitive preposition seems unexpected here, but both the gemination and the choice of vowel seem to indicate its presence. The combination of a singular 2sg addressee with an unambiguous plural ‘camels’ also seems odd. The proposed reading should thus be taken with a grain of salt.

<līḡ ʔāmis yulāḡan> ليغ ءاميس يلاغن
Ley amis yolayān. 'I have a good he-camel.'

122. I want to cross the desert.

انا بدى اقطع الشول
<rīḡ aḡatas nāšūl> ريغ ائتس نأشول
Reḡ aḡatas n Ašul. 'I want to cross Ashul.'⁸¹

123. Is there any danger in the road?

في خوف في الدرب (Is there fear in the road?)
تھا ٹكسّ الدرب
Tāha tuksāḡa āddārāb? 'Is there fear in the road?'

124. How long will it take us to get to Tadmor?

كم بدنا تدمر
<māhīn yaqīman itadmar> ماهين يقيمن إتدمر
Ma-hin yāqqimān e Tādmār? 'What remains away for Tadmor?'

125. Can we go by Mount Sina to Hebron?

يمكن نروح من طور سناء الى الخليل
<yamūkkan ʔidmanḡar day aṭṭūr
ʔār 'lخاليل>
Yāmmokkān ed-mānḡār dāḡ Āṭṭor ar Ālخاليل? 'Can I return⁸² from
Mount Sinai to Hebron?'

126. We want to go to Bagdad.

نحن بدنا نروح الى بغداد
<nara iminḡār an bayḡdād> نر إمنغار أن بغداء
Nāra emenḡar ən Bāḡdad. 'We want to return to Baghdad.'

127. We want to go to the Jordan and to the Dead Sea

نحن بدنا نروح الى الاردون والى بحيرة لوط
<nara iminḡār nā 'rdūn ʔd bḡīrat lūt> نر إمنغار نا اردون اء بحيرة لوط
Nāra emenḡar n Ardun əd Bḡerāt Loṭ. 'We want to return to
Jordan and the Lake of Lot.'

<p. 10 = Kayat 1844, p. 40-42>

81 Kayat uses الشول for 'desert'—this word is a borrowing of Turkish *çöl* 'desert', but evidently it was understood by the scribe as a proper noun.

82 Heath glosses this verb as 'return to camp before nightfall', corresponding to Arabic *rawwaḡ* rather than to *rūḡ*.

128. But we prefer coming back by St. Sabba's and Bethlehem.⁸³
 لكن نحن نرغب نرجع عن طريق مرسا \ با وبيتى لحم
 نارا إد ناqqال سābaraqa marsā <nara id naqqal sābaraqa marsā
 / ʔāxil wān sān>
 Nāra ed-nāqqāl s ābārāqqa (n) mārsa / āxil wan san. 'We want
 to come back by the harbour road / direction of meat.'
129. I want a strong camel for the tent and luggage
 انا بدى جمل قادر منشأ الغيم والدبش
 ريغ أَمِش يَصُوهِنْ فُول تَخْيَامْت <rīḡ amis yaṣūhin fūl taxyāmt>
 Rey amis yāṣṣohen foll tāxyamt. 'I want a strong camel for the
 tent.'
130. How much do you charge for the whole journey?
 قدركم اجرة تريح منشأ كل السفرة
 مَادْ يُوَكَّةَ الْكَرَانْكَ فُول نَاكْ أَسِيكَايَل <mād yūkda lkarānnak fūl nāk
 asikayl⁸⁴>
 Ma-d yogda lkāra-nnāk foll nak asikəl? 'How much is your hire
 for the whole journey?'
131. How much the camel per day?
 كم اجرة الجمل بالنها
 مَادْ يُوَكَّةَ الْكَرَا نَامِيشْ يَهْل <mād yūkda lkarā nāmīs yahall>
 Ma-d yogda lkāra n amis y-āhāl? 'How much is the rent of the
 camel per day?'
132. We give you twenty dollars a day.
 نحن نعطيك عشرين ريال بالنها
 إِهَكْنَجْ سَنَاتْمَرْوِينْ نَرِيَالْ يَهْل <ihaknaj sanattamarwīn narīyāl yahal>
 E-hak nāḡ sānat tāmārwen n āriyyal y-āhāl. 'We will put for you
 twenty riyals per day.'
133. I want a Bedwin dress.
 انا بدى لبس بدوى
 أَرِيغْ تَلْبِشْ تَلْبَدَاوِي <arīḡ tilays nalbadawī>
 Ārey telāsse⁸⁵ n ālbādāwi 'I want a Bedouin's clothing.'

83 Written over two separate lines in the ms., with Saba broken up—likely impacting on the understanding.

84 Accidental transposition of <y> and <k>?

85 Assuming—hazardously—that two letters were accidentally transposed by the scribe.

134. Alight here.

حول هنا
أَبْرُوغُ إِلِّي <abrūḡ illī>
Abroy ill-e. 'The blanket is here.'

135. Take us the nearest road.

خذنا بدرب القريبه
أَجْدَ نَعْ أَلْكَرَبْ يُوْهَازَنْ <ajda naḡ addarab yūhāẓan>
Aḡd(?)⁸⁶ -anāḡ äddārāb yohaẓān. 'Take(?) us the nearby road.'

(Dialogue 7: Discourse with a Captain of a Ship or Boat)

136. Captain, where do you come from?

يا ربيس من اين جايي
يَا رَايِسْ مَنِسْتَهِيْدُ <ya rāyis manistahīd>
Ya rayās, mani-s tāhed? 'Captain, where are you from?'

137. What is your ship?⁸⁷

ايش مركبك
مَا تَامُوسْ تُرْفَتْنَكْ <mā tamūs turaftannak>
Ma tamos torāft-ənnāk? 'What is your ship?'

138. Have you a good cabin?

عندك كارمه مليح
تَلِيدْ كَارْمَهْ تُلَاغَتْ <talīd kārma tulāḡat>
Tāled karma⁸⁸ tolaḡāt? 'Do you have a good cabin?'

139. What size is your boat?

قدرايش شغورك
(left blank in ms.)

140. We will employ it by the month

نحن نستكرها في المشاهر
إِيْهَكَتْ نَكْرَ آسْ تَلِيْتْ <iḥakat nakra as tallīt>
E-hak-kāt nākra ʾas tallit. 'We will rent it to you by the month.'

86 This verb was not found in sources examined, so its meaning and exact form are unclear.

87 Skipped in ms.: Is she a brig or a schooner?

88 Neither translated nor nativised, this noun was probably simply not understood by the scribe.

141. We want to go along <the coast to Jaffa.>⁸⁹
نحن بدنا نروح الشطى الشطى الى يافا
أربغ أدتواي أجم أجم أر يافا <arīḡ adnawāya aḡama aḡama ʔār yāfā>
Äreḡ ed nawaya(?)⁹⁰ aḡāma aḡāma ar Yafa. 'I want us to go(?)
outside until Jaffa.'

53

<p. 9 = Kayat 1844, p. 42-45>

142. Are there any steamers here?
في مراكب نار هنا
آلانت تورفين آن تمسي <allānat tūrafīn an tamsī>
Əllānāt torāfen ən tāmse? 'Are there boats of fire?'
143. When do you start?
ايمتى بتسافر
أم تريد أسيكال <ʔammi tarīd ʔasīkal>
Əmme tāred asikəl? 'When do you want to travel?'
144. How is the wind?
كيف الريح
هوند ءاڤو <hünd ʔāḍu>
Hund aḍu 'Like wind'
145. Here is your present.
هاه بخشيشك
هيكى إلكك <hīkay ilakannak>
He-kāy elāk-ənnāk. 'Here is your wage.'
146. Adieu!
مع السلامة
ياديو دالسلامة <yadīw da 'lssalāmat>
Yāddew d āssālamāt 'He has gone with well-being.'

(Dialogue 8: Discourse with a Cook)

147. We want to breakfast early.⁹¹
نحن بدنا نتعش بكير (We want to have dinner early)
نَجَال آمكين تَدَكَّت <najāl amagīn tadakkat>

89 The English part in square brackets was physically cut off of the page, but can be restored by reference to the phrasebook.

90 Unidentified 1pl. verb.

91 Skipped in ms.: Cook, what have you for dinner?

Nəʒyal aməgin n tadəggat. 'We would like afternoon dinner.'

148. Can you cook European dishes?⁹²

تقدر تطبخ اكل افريقي
<tasānad asanyī>
Təssānəd asəŋgi? 'Do you know cooking?'

149. We want native dishes.

نحن نريد طيبين البلاد
<najḡāl amaknu nakal>
Nəḡḡāl amākno n ākal. 'We would like the cuisine of the country.'

150. I like good coffee.

انا بريد قهو طيبه
<nak rīḡ alqahwa tazīdat>
Nāk reḡ ālqāhwa tāzēdāt. 'I like good coffee.'

151. We want fresh milk every morning and every evening

نحن بدنا حليب طازه على بكره وعشيه
<rīḡ ḡāx kafāyan tūfat tadakkat>
Reḡ ax kāfayān tufat tadəggat. 'I want fresh milk morning and evening.'

152. Can you get good beef here?

يوجد لحم بقر طيب هنا
<ʔid naḡru īsan tas ʔažīdnīn>
Ed nəḡru isan n tas āžednen? 'Will we get good cow meat?'

153. Is the mutton good here?

لحم الغنم طيب هنا
<īsan nūli ažīdnīn ʔilā dīn>
Isan n ulli āžednen illa den? 'Is there good goat meat there?'

154. Get some fresh eggs

جيب شوي بيضان طرايه
<awīd ʔadrūsan ʔan tasadalīn
aynāyni⁹³>
Awi-d a dārusān ən təsādalen āynaynen. 'Bring a little fresh eggs.'

92 Skipped in ms.: Do you know how to make pudding?

93 Here and in no. 310, it seems that the second of a final sequence of two <n>s has been haploglised.

155. Light the candles

اضر الشمع

أَنِّعْ إِينِرْ <anʕi inīr>

Ānɣ ener. 'Put out the candle.'

55

156. Make fire.

اعمل نار

أَكَنْ تِيمْسِ <akan tīmsi>

Əkən temse. 'Make fire.'

157. Call me early

فيقني بكير

سَنْكَرْ تُفَاتْ <sankari tufāt>

Sənkər-i tufat. 'Wake me up in the morning.'

158. We want some cream.

بَدْنَا شَوِي قَشْطَه

نَجْعَالْ أَدْرُوسَن تَلْقِشْطَه <nağɣāl adarūsan nalqišṭah>

Nəğɣal a dārūsən n əlqišṭa. 'We would like a little cream.'

<p. 12 = Kayat 1844, p. 45-48>

159. Pay the man

دفع للرجال (Pay the men)

أَكْفْ إِيْمِيدَانْ <ʔakf ʔīmīddan>

Ākf e meddān. 'Give to the men.'

160. Give me the account

اعطيني الحساب

أَكْفِيدْ مِيَصَانْ <ʔakfīd mīḍān>

Ākf-i-d meḍan. 'Give me the account.'

161. Get everything ready

حضر كل شيء

زَهَيَّيْدْ أَتِيلَيْنْ <zahayyīd ʔātillayn>

Zəhəyyi-d a t-illan⁹⁴. 'Prepare whatever there is.'

162. Bring some hot water

جيب امويه سخون

أَوِيْدْ أَمَانْ أَكُوشْنِيْنْ <awīd ʔāman ʔakūsniṇ>

94 Following a plausible suggestion by Maarten Kossmann's, we assume transposition of <y> and <l> here, provoked by the frequency in Arabic of final <yn>.

Awi-d aman äkkusnen. 'Bring hot water.'

163. Have you any butter?

عند سمنى

تليدُ أُدي <talīd ʔudī>

Tāled udi? 'Do you have butter?'

(Dialogue 9: Discourse with a Servant Previous to Starting a Journey)

164. Joseph, we must start to-morrow morning

يا يوسف بدنا نساfer بكرة بكير

يوسف ناز أسكيل أمود أمود <yūsaf nāra ʔasikayl ʔamūd ʔamūd>

Yusaf, nāra asikəl amud amud. 'Yusuf, we want to travel at prayer time.'

165. Get the luggage ready.

حضر الدبش

زهيد تيلسى <zihīd tīlassī>

Zəhəyyi-d telässe. 'Prepare the clothes.'

166. Have you every thing for the journey

انت محضر كل لوازم السفر

تزهيد تالغ نسيك <təzəhəyyid tālɣa nasīkal>

Təzəhəyyed talɣa n əsikəl? 'Have you prepared the matters of the journey?'

167. Take plenty of rice with you

خذ معك رز كثير

تاويد تافعت تيجت <tāwyad tāfayāt tağīt>

Tawyād tafāɣāt tāğget. 'Bring lots of rice.'

168. Do not forget the sugar.

لا تنس السكر

وارتو السكر <wartatuwwa 'ssukar>

Wār tatəw əssukār. 'Don't forget the sugar.'

169. We must have plenty of good Mocha coffee.

لازم يكون معنا قهو حجازي كثير

إلزامناخ إدنوي هرت نالقيهو <ilzāmanay ʔidnawī harat nilqihwa>

Ilzam-anəɣ ed-nawī hārāt n əlqāhwa. 'We need to bring some coffee.'

170. Take with you salt and pepper.

خذ معك ملح وفلفل

توايد تيسمت أد شيطا <tawayad tīsamt ʔad šīṭa>

Tawyād tesāmt əd šēṭa. 'You should bring salt and pepper.'

171. Put the provision saddlebag under you.

حطو خرج الزواء تحتك
 أَجْ أَسَتْوَزْ نَالَزَادْ دَاوَكْ <ʔaǧ ʔasatwar nālzād dāwak>
 Āǧ asətwər n āzzad daw-ək. 'Put the provision storage bag
 under you.'

57

172. Take some wine also.

خْ مَعَكْ شَوَيْتْ نَبِيْهْ
 تَوَيْدْ هَرَتْ نَلْخَامَضْ <tawayd harat nālxāmāḍ>
 Tawyaḍ hārāt n ālxamāḍ. 'You should bring some wine.'

173. Take care of the luggage

دِيرْ بِالْكَ عَلَى الْإِوَاعِيْ
 أَكَظْ إِسُوسَرْ <ʔakəḥ ʔisūsar>
 Agəḥ isusar. 'Take care of the luggage.'

174. Buy some good tobacco.⁹⁵

اشْتَرِيْ شَوَيْتْ دَحَانْ طَبِيْبْ
 زَهْيِيْ هَرَتْ اَنْ تَابْ تُلَايَاتْ <zahīd harat an tāba tulāyāt>
 Zəhəyyi-d hārāt ən taba tolayāt. 'Prepare some good tobacco.'

175. Are you ready⁹⁶

اَنْتْ حَاضِرْ
 تَقِيْمَمْ مِيْغْ <taqīmad mīḡ>
 Tāqqeməd mey? 'Are you staying?'

176. Fill this with cold water.

مَلْ هَادْ مَوِيْهْ بَارِدْ
 أَطْكَرْدْ وَآ أَمَانْ سَمِيْدْنِيْنْ <ʔaṭkərd wā ʔāman samīdnīn>
 Āṭkār-d wā aman sāmmədnen. 'Fill this with cold water.'

<p. 11 = Kayat 1844, p. 48-51>

177. Give us something to eat

عَطِيْنَا شَيْءْ نَاكَلْ
 أَكْفَانَايْدْ ʔَانَاḐْ <ʔakfānayd ʔanaḥ>
 Ākf-anāy-d a nāčč. 'Give us something to eat.'

178. Give the muleteers something to eat

عَطِيْ الْمَكَارِيْهْ شَيْءْ لِّلَاكَلْ
 إِكْفْ إِمَكَارِيْيَنْ هَرَتْ إِشَانْ <ʔikfa ʔimakāriyyan harat ʔišan>

95 Skipped in ms.: Clean my pipe

96 Skipped in ms.: Put this cup in your pocket

Ikfa imākariyān hārāt əččan. 'He gave the muleteers something, they ate.'

179. We want some grapes

بَدْنَا شَوَيْت عَنب
<nasīdaran harat nā 'zzabīb>
Nāsīdārān hārāt n āzzābīb. 'We wish for some grapes/raisins.'

180. Can you get some ripe figs?

تَقْدِرْ تَجِيبْ شَوَيْت تَيْنِ مَسْتَوِحِي
<tadūbid ?iḥanay tāwyad harat
nāḏaran>
Tāddobed e-hanay tawyād hārāt n azarān? 'Can you bring us some figs?'

181. Take some bread.⁹⁷

خُبْزْ
<?awīd tuknīft>
Awi-d tuknift. 'Bring bread.'

182. Take a boiled fowl with you.

خُبْزْ مَعَكَ دَجَاجَه مَسْلُوقَه
<?awīd tikahīt tanḡāt>
Awi-d tekāhit tāḡḡat. 'Bring a cooked chicken.'

183. Take with you all kitchen apparatus.

خُبْزْ مَعَكَ أَلَّةَ الْمَطْبَخِ (Take with you the kitchen apparatus)
<?awīd tiḡīran nasanyī>
Awi-d tiḡeren n āsəḡḡi. 'Bring the cooking pots.'

184. Shut the door of the tent.

سَكَّرْ بَابَ الْخِيَمَةِ (Shut/sugar the door of the tent.)
<alsukar īhā ?imīn taxyāmt>
Āssukār iha imi n tāxyamt. 'The sugar is at the door of the tent.'

185. You can go to bed now.

رُوحْ نَامِ الْآنَ
<sīkal ?ns dimarday>
Sīkal āns dimar-dāḡ. 'Go sleep now.'

(Dialogue 10: Discourse with a Man who keeps a Khan or Caravansary)

97 Kayat: Take some bread and biscuits.

186. O Caravansary Keeper! what have you for food?
يا خانجي شو عند بلاكل
<mandām ṭilla ḡawurak ṭanaš> مَمْدَامْ ṭILLA ḡAWURAK ṬANAŠ
Māndam illa ḡor-ək a nāčč? 'So-and-so, is there something with
you for us to eat?' 59
187. Every thing you want.
كل ما تريه
<ṭarīd ṭillā> أَتَرِيدُ ṬILLĀ
A tāred illa. 'There is whatever you want.'
188. Have you good bread?
عندك خبز طيب
<talīd tuknīft tulāḡat> تَلِيدُ تُكْنِيفْتُ تُلَاغَاتُ
Tāled tuknift tolayāt? 'Do you have good bread?'
189. Give us good wine.
عطينا شوبت نبيد عال
<ṭakfanāḡ alxamaḡ wāyūfan> أَكْفَنَاعُ الْخَمَصُ وَآيُوفَنُ
Ākf-anāḡ ālxamāḡ wa yufan. 'Give us the wine which is better.'
190. We like some fried eggs.
نريد شوية بيضان مقلية
<ṭaḡḡālāḡ tisadalīn aknāfnīn> أَطْغَالَاغُ تِسَدَالِينَ أَكْنَافْنِينَ
Ṭḡalāḡ tisādalen əknafnen. 'I would like fried eggs.'
191. Have you any fruits?
عندك فواكه
<talīd alfuwaki> تَلِيدُ الْفُوَاكِ
Tāled ālfəwaki? 'Do you have fruits?'
192. Bring us some fresh milk.
جيب لنا شوبت حليب طري
<ṭawīd ṭāx kafāyan> أَوِيدُ آخْ كَفَايَنُ
Awi-d ax kāfayān. 'Bring fresh milk.'
193. Is there any village near here?⁹⁸
ضيعه قريب لهذا
<ṭīha ṭidak yūhazan> إِيهَ إِدَكُ يُوَهَظَنُ
Iha edāḡ yohazān? 'Is it in a place near here?'
194. Can we get any mutton?
بتقدر تجيب لنا لحم غنم

98 Skipped in ms.: How far?

تَدُوْبِدْ إِهْنَعْ تَاوِيْدْ إِسْنُ نُلِي <tadūbid ?iḥanay tāwyad ?isan nnulī>
Tāddobed e-ḥanay tawyād isan n ulli? 'Can you bring us mut-
ton?'

195. Cook us some roast mutton.

اعمل لنا شويْت لحم مشوي
اَكْنَفَانَيْ هَرَتْ اِنْسَانُ نُلِي <aknafanay harat insān nulī>
Əknəf-anəy ḥārət ən san n ulli. 'Roast us some mutton.'

<p. 14 = Kayat 1844, p. 51-55>

196. We like some mutton broth.

بَدْنَا شَوِيَّةَ مَرْقَةِ لَحْمَةٍ غَنَمٍ
نَسِيرَرَانْ هَرَتْ نَسِيمُ نُلِي <nasiraran harat nasīm nulī>
Nāsīdārān ḥārət n āsem n ulli 'We desire some melted sheep
fat.'

197. Make us some rice soup.

اعمل لنا شورب رز
اَكْنَانَيْ لِيْوَا اَنْ تَاْفَايَتْ <aknānay ?līwā ?an tāfayāt>
Ăkn-anəy āliwa ən tafayāt. 'Make us rice soup.'

198. How much is the account?

كَمْ الْحَسَابِ
مَا دْ يُوْكْدَا مِيْدَانْ <mād yūkdā mīḍān>
Ma-d yogda meḍan? 'How much is the account equal to?'

199. Good bye!⁹⁹

خاطرِكم
سَالْخِيْرَيَا <sālḫīryā>
S ālḫer ya. 'With goodness.'

(*Dialogue 11: Discourse with a general merchant concerning commerce*)

200. Welcome!¹⁰⁰

اهلا وسهلا
تِيْدَاوِيْتْ هُوْلَانْ <tidawīt ḥūllan>
Tedāwit ḥullan! 'Much gladness!'

99 Same as no. 29.

100 Skipped in ms.: Mr. Joseph, I want to ask you something regarding com-
merce.

201. What is your commerce here?
 ايش متجركم هنا
 <māhīn tazanhīm> ماهين تازانهيم
 Ma-hin tăzzañhim? 'What do you sell?'
202. Silk chiefly
 الإغلب حرير
 <ajut alxarīr> أَجُتْ أَلْخَرِيرُ
 Āğut ālxārīr. 'The greater part is silk.'
203. Have you any commerce with England?
 لكم متجر مع بلاد الانكليز
 <talām ḡimasūkāl dāy ankilīz> تَلَامْ إِمَسُوكَلْ دَغْ أَتْكِيلِزْ
 Təlam iməssukal dāy Ənkəliz? 'Do you have any traders in England?'
204. Do you get any goods from England?¹⁰¹
 تجيبوا بضاعة من بلاد الانكليز
 <tarām ḡakāy nassalyāt dāy akal naklīz> تَرَامْ أَكَايْ نَسْلُغَّةْ دَغْ أَكَلْ نَكْلِيزْ
 Tāram aggay n əssālyāt dāy ākal n Əkliz? 'Do you want the bringing of goods from the land of the English?'
205. Where do you get your sugar and coffee?
 من اين بتجيّبوا القهو والسكر
 <mānid ḡitawyam alqahwa da 'ssukar> مَايْدْ إِيْتَوِيْمْ أَلْقَهْوْ دَ الشُّكْرْ
 Mani-d i ttawyām ālqāhwa d əssukār? 'Where do you bring coffee and sugar from?'
206. Have you any commerce with France?
 لكم متجر مع فرنسه
 <talām ḡimasūkāl dāy faranṣīṣ> تَلَامْ إِمَسُوكَلْ دَغْ فَرَنْصِيصْ
 Təlam iməssukal dāy Fārənṣeṣ? 'Do you have any traders in France?'
207. How many ships come to Beyroot in the course of the year?
 كم مركب يجي الى بيروت بالسنة
 <mīnakit turfīn ad tāsanīn dāy awatāy> مِينَكِتْ تُرْفِينْ اءْ تَاسَنِينْ دَغْ أَوَاتَايْ
 Men-āket torfen a-d tasənen dāy āwātay? 'How many boats come in a year?'

208. Have you any ships from Germany?¹⁰²
يحيكم مراكب من بلاد النمسه
<tasānad turfin day namsāmiḡ>
Təssanād torfen dāḡ Nāmsa meḡ? 'Do you know boats from Austria?'
209. What do you send to Europe?
ايش تبعنوا الى بلاد الافرنج
<mā tasāwayam sākal nafrunji>
Ma təsawayām s ākal n Āfrənji? 'What do you send to the land of the Frank?'
210. I want to settle here.
انا بدّي استقم هنا
<rīḡ tākallāwt dīday>
Reḡ takəllawt dedāḡ. 'I want to spend the day here.'
211. I want a good clerk.
انا بدّي كاتب طيب
<rīḡ ?anaktāb yulāḡan>
Reḡ ānaktab yolaḡān. 'I want a good writer.'
212. I want to hire a warehouse.
انا بدّي استكري مخزن
<rīḡ ?idakrūy taḡurfīt>
Reḡ ed akruḡ taḡorfit. 'I want to rent a storeroom.'
213. I will bring you any goods you like from England upon commission
انا بيب لك اي رزق تريد من بلاد الانقليز تحت المعلوم
<?ihakad awyaḡ alrrazḡan tarīd day anqilīz>
E-hak-əd awyāḡ ərrəzəḡān tāred dāḡ Əngəliz. 'I will bring you sustenance that you like from England.'
- <p. 13 = Kayat 1844, p. 55-60>
214. Goodbye¹⁰³
خاطرکم

102 Omitted: or Italy.

103 Same as nos. 29 and 199. Skipped in ms.: Captain Ibrahim, is your boat new?

سَالْخَيْرِيَا <sālḫīrīyā>

S ālḫer ya 'With goodness.'

(Dialogue 12: Discourse with a Captain of a Boat Ascending the Nile)

63

215. We want to go up to Cairo.
نحن نريد نطلع الى مصر (We want to go up¹⁰⁴ to Cairo)
<narā ahanay an maṣar>
Nāra ahānay ən Maṣār. 'We want to see Egypt.'
216. How many men have you?
كم بحري معك (How many sailors do you have?)
مِينِكْت خَدِيمَن تَرْفَت تَلِيد <minaykit xadīman turaft talīd>
Men-āket xādīmān¹⁰⁵ n torāft tāled? 'How many boat workers do you have?'
217. We do not want any other passengers.
نحن لا نريد غير ركاب (We want only riders)
<warnari ṭartiḡraḡās>
Wār nāre ar tiḡra(?)¹⁰⁶ ḡas. 'We want only riders(?).'
218. We will hire you all the time of our passage on the Nile.
نحن نستكيرك كل مدة سفرنا على النيل
<narā ṭikay nukūrunākk ṭasikal nanay daḡ annīl>
Nāra e-kāy nəkurru nak asikəl-nānāḡ daḡ Ānnil. 'We want to hire you for our whole journey on the Nile.'
219. Where will you anchor to-night?¹⁰⁷
وين يدك مرسى الليله
<mānida tasaxsarad ṭihaḍ wāday>
Mani-da tāsaxsarād ehāḍ wadāḡ? 'Where are you staying to-night?'

(Dialogue 13: Missionary Discourse)

220. Of what religion are you?
من اين ديانته انت

104 Perhaps misread as *naṭṭaliṣ* '(we) inspect'.

105 The absence of *āl-* here is surprising.

106 Word not found in dictionaries consulted, so exact sense unclear.

107 Skipped in ms.: Pray have the boat very clean.

- ما يَمُوشِ الدِّينَ وَاشْتَلَكَمَهُ <mā yamūs addīn wāstalkamad>
Ma yāmos āddin wa-s tēlkāmād? 'What is the religion that you follow?'
221. Are you a Christian?
انت نصراني
كَيِّ أَنْصَرَانِي مِيْع <kayy ʔanaṣrānī mīy>
Kāy anāṣrani meḡ? 'Are you a Christian?'
222. Do you believe in the only true God?
تومن بالاله الواحد الحقيقي
تُومَانَدَ أَشْ مَسِينَعْ أَشْ إِيْتَنْ هَدِيْبَا <tūmānad as masīnaḡ as ʔiyan hadīḡan>
Tumanād as Māss-ināḡ as əyyān hāddiḡān? 'Do you believe that God is one, pure?'
223. Do you love Christ?
تحب المسيح
تَرِيْدَ الْمَسِيْعِ <tarīd almasīḡa>
Tāred ālmasiḡ a? 'Do you love the Messiah?'
224. Did you ever read the Gospel?¹⁰⁸
قريت الانجيل
تَغْرِيدُ الْإِنْجِيلِ <taḡrīd alanjīl>
Tāḡred Ālənjl? 'Have you read the Gospel?'
225. I make you a present of the Word of God.¹⁰⁹
انا بهديك بكتاب الله
أَرْيَعُ إِكِيْطُطْلَغْ سَالِكِتَابَ اِنْ مَسِينَعْ <ʔarīḡ ʔikayḡḡḡḡḡḡ sālkitaba an-masīnaḡ>
Āreḡ e-kāy ḡḡḡḡḡḡ s ālkitab n Māss-ināḡ. 'I want to present you with the book of God.'
226. We worship God only.
نحن نسجد لله فقط
نَكَانِيْذْ وَارْ نَتِيْمُحُوْدْ ءَأَنْ إِيْمَسِيْنَعْ <nakaniḡ wār natimuhūd ʔan ʔīmasīnaḡ>
Nākkāneḡ wār nətimuhud ar i Māss-ināḡ. 'We pray to none but God.'

108 Skipped in ms: I believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; Do you serve the Lord Jesus?

109 Skipped in ms: The most holy Trinity; Jesus Christ is the only Saviour

227. All good comes from God.¹¹⁰

كل شيء طيب من الله
<ayjā masīnay ʔiyalāuyan>

A iḡa Māss-inay i yolayān. 'Whatever God has done is good.'

65

228. Trust in God

جعل رجاك بالله
<zakzan ʔīmasīnay>
Ḍāgḏān i Māss-ināy. 'Trust in God.'

229. Let us pray

فلنصلي
<namuhudīt>
Nəmuḥəd-et. 'Let us pray.'

230. Do you know the Lord's prayer?

تعرف صلوة الربانية
<tasānad amūd wahadījan>
Təssanād amud wa ḥaddiḡān? 'Do you know the pure prayer?'

231. Have you learnt the Ten Commandments

تعلمت العشر وصايا
<tasānad alwaṣīyitīn marāwat>
Təssanād ālwāṣīyyāten mārāwāt? 'Do you know the Ten Com-
mandments?'

232. In the Bible every thing is written concerning our salvation

في الكتاب المقدس كل شيء مكتوب لخلاصنا
<ʔiḥa 'lkitāba nalquds>
Iḥa ālkitaba n ālquds. 'It is in the holy book.'

<p. 16 = Kayat 1844, p. 60-63>

233. God bless you!¹¹¹

الله يبارك عليك
<iḡarya yallah dak albarakah>
Iḡarya(?)¹¹² Yālla d-ək ālbārāka. 'May God put(?) blessing in you.'

110 Skipped in ms: Search your heart; Jesus is the only way to heaven; Be-
lieve in Christ, and you shall be saved; Faith is the gift of grace

111 Skipped in ms.: Pray for me

112 Unidentified verb.

234. Have you any schools here?
 عندكم مدارس هنا
 تَلَامْ إِدَّاكْ إِنْ تَقْرِي مِيْعْ <talām iddak ina taḡarī mīḡ>
 Təlam edāg n təḡäre mey? 'Do you have a place of study?'
235. Where is the school?
 فين المدرسة
 مَنَّاكِيدْ إِيوَيْدْ تَغَارْرَامْ <minakīd iwayd taḡarrām>
 Menakid e way-d təḡarrām? 'Where is it that you study?'
236. Who is the schoolmaster?
 من هو معلم المدرسة
 مَانِ أَلْفَقِي نَوْنْ <māni alfaqi nnawan>
 Mani ālfāqqi nnāwān? 'Where is your teacher?'
237. What do you teach?
 ماذا تعلم
 مَا تَغَارْرَامْ <mā taḡārrām>
 Ma təḡarrām? 'What do you study?'
238. What books do you use?¹¹³
 أي كتب تستعملون
 مَا يَمُوسْ أَلْكِتَابْ وَ أَتْلِيلَمْ <mā yamūs alkitāb wa atalīlām>
 Ma yāmos ālkitāb wa tāllilām? 'What is the book that you follow?'
239. Where is the school established?
 اي متى ترتب هاذو المدرسة (When do you organise this school?)
 أَنَسْ أَمِيرْ وَ أَشْتَغَارْمْ <anns amir wa 'stayāram>
 Ənnəs āmer a-s təḡarrām? 'Which time is it that you study?'
240. Do you teach the Bible?
 اتعلم التوراة
 تَسَانَدْ أَلْتُّورَاةُ <tasānad attūrāt>
 Təssanād Ättorat? 'Do you know the Torah?'
241. How is the school supported?
 من ينفق على المدرسة (Who spends on the school?)
 مِيْتِيْعُسُورَانْ فُونْ تَقْرِي نَوْنْ <mītiḡussuran fūn taḡarī nawan>
 Mi tiḡussurān foll təḡäre nāwān? 'Who is spending on your study?'

113 Skipped in ms.: What religious instruction do you give?

242. I will teach your children.

أنا بعلم اولادك
 <?arīḡ ?asayri mmaddānak>
 Āreḡ asāḡri n maddan-ək. 'I want to teach your sons.'

67

243. I will open a school gratis.

أنا بفتح مدرس مجاناً
 <?arīḡ ?ār anta<r>ḡarīnawan>
 Āreḡ arr ən tāḡāre-nāwān. 'I want to open your studying.'

244. Have you any female school?

عندكم مدرسه للبنات
 <talām ?iwad ḡarranāt tabaraḡīn>
 Təlam ewa-d ḡarrənāt tābāraḡen? 'Do you have a place where the girls study?'

245. My wife will teach your girls.

حرمتي تعلم بناتكم
 <tamiḡīn ?īhawan tasaḡar ?īššikwan>
 Tamāṭ-in e-hawān təsəḡār ešš-ek(kā)wān. 'My wife will teach your daughters for you.'

246. Have you a printing-press here?

عندكم مطبعه هنا
 <talām ?attābay nālkatāb mīḡ>
 Təlam āttabāḡ n ālkətab meḡ? 'Do you have a book press?'

247. What books do you print?¹¹⁴

ماذا الكتب الذين تطبعون
 <mā yamūs ?awā tatābayam>
 Ma yāmos awa tətabbāḡām? 'What do you print?'

248. Can you read?

بتعرف تقرا
 <tarīd tīḡarī mīḡ>
 Tāred teḡāre meḡ? 'Do you want to study?'

<p. 15 = Kayat 1844, p. 63-67>

249. Is this your sister?

هذه اختك
 <mayṡay walatmāk>

114 Skipped in ms.: Show me this book; What is your name, my boy?

Mex ta wälätma-k? 'Is this your sister?'

250. Can she read?

هبي بتعرف تقرأ <tarā lammudat ?an tayrī>
Tāra lammudāt ən täḡäre? 'Do you want to learn to read?'

251. Why do you not teach her?

لېش ما بتعلمها
ما فوول وژهستيسلماد <mā fūl war hastisalmadad>
Ma foll wār-has tāsalmadād? 'Why do you not teach her?'

252. Do you know arithmetic?

انت بتعرف علم الحساب
تريد ميسنات إن ميسان <tarīd musnat ?in mīḍān>
Tāred musnāt ən meḍan? 'Do you want to know arithmetic?'

253. I can teach you.

انا بحسن بعلمك
أجعالك إيهككن أسلماد <?aḡḡālay ?īhakakn asalmad>
Əḡḡalāḡ e-hak ākn asəlməd. 'I would like to do well for you in teaching.'

254. Come to me every day at noon.

تعالى لعد كل يوم الظهر
تاسيد ناك إمغري <tāsīd nāk ?imaḡrī>
Tas-i-d nak emāḡri. 'Come to me every noon.'

255. Do you like to learn English?

تريد تتعلم انكليزي
تريد ميسنات أنتكليزيت <tarīd musnat antakalīzit>
Tāred musnāt ən tākəlīzit. 'You want to know English.'

256. You must continue.

انت لازم تداوم
كاي غاس اتبات <kay ḡās atbat>
Kāy ḡas ətbət. 'You, just continue.'

257. Learning is obtained by perseverance.

العلم يتحصل بالاجتهاد
ميسنات وارجارو آسستيسست <musnat warjaruw ?ār astusīst>
Musnāt wār ḡarru ar əs tusist. 'Knowledge is gathered only by effort.'

258. Learn to read write well.

تعلم الكتابه جيداً
ألماد أكاتب يلاغان <almad ?akatab yulāḡan>

Əlməd akātab yolaḡān. 'Learn good writing.'

259. Give me the ink.

اعطيني العبر
أَكْفِيدُ أَمَدُ <?akfīd ?ammadu>
Äkf-i-d aməddu. 'Give me the ink.'

260. Give me the pen.

اعطيني القلم
أَكْفِيدُ أَغَانِيبُ <?akfīd ?aḡānīb>
Äkf-i-d äḡanib. 'Give me the pen.'

261. Give me a sheet of paper.¹¹⁵

اعطيني طوحبة ورق
أَكْفِيدُ هَرَتْ نَلْكَأُ <?akfīd harat nalkāḡ>
Äkf-i-d hārät n älkaḡ. 'Give me some paper.'

(Dialogue 15. Discourse with an Eastern Bishop)

262. Good morning, my Lord Bishop¹¹⁶

صباح الخير يا سيدنا
تُفَتُّ نَلْخِيرُ وَايُوفَنُ <tufat nalxīr wāyūfan>
Tufat n älxer, wa yufan. 'Good morning, superior.'

263. I am anxious to learn all particulars respecting the Christians here.

انا مقصود اعرف كلشي بخصوص النصارى هنا
أَجْعَالُغُ مُسْنَتُ تَاتِيلَيْنُ هُولُنُ أَوَّلُ تَنْتَضْرَانِتُ <aḡḡālāḡ musnat nātilayn
hūllan awal ntnaṣrānit>
Əḡḡālāḡ musnät n a-t illan¹¹⁷ hullan awal n Tānāṣranit. 'I would
very much like to know whatever there is, regarding¹¹⁸ Christi-
anity.'

264. How many are the Christians in this place?

قدركم النصارى هنا
مَا أَوْكُدُ النَّصَارَ دِيدَغُ <mād awkuda 'nnuṣāra dīday>
Ma-d ogdan Ännāṣara didāḡ? 'How many are the Christians

115 Skipped in ms.: Show me the Bishop's house (Metropolitan)

116 Skipped in ms.: Is your Lordship the orthodox Bishop?

117 As above, this is assumed to show transposition of <y> and <l>.

118 Context suggests that *awal* 'word' is being used here effectively as a preposition 'concerning, regarding'.

here?’

265. Are there any other sects of Christians here?

موجود غير طوياف النصر هنا

<?illāt ?īsan annaṣāra dīday>

Illa-t isan¹¹⁹ n Ānnāṣara diday? ‘Are there sects of Christians here?’

266. How many churches have you?

كم كنيسة عندكم

مِينَكْت تَمَزْدَجَاوِينْ أَنْ كُفَارْ تَلَامْ <mīnakit tamazdījawīn an kufār talām>

Men-āket tāmazdīgawen ən kufar tēlam? ‘How many infidels’ mosques do you have?’

<p. 18 = Kayat 1844, p. 67-72>

267. Are you allowed to build new churches?

هل تقدرؤا تعمروا كنائس جدء

تَدُوْبِمُ الْعَمَارَةُ إِنْ تَمَزْدَجَاوِينْ أَيْنَائِينْ <tadūbim ‘lḡamārt ?in

tamazdīgāwīn ?aynāynīn>

Tāddobem ālḡamarāt ən tāmazdīgawen āynaynen? ‘Can you establish new mosques?’

268. How old is your church?

كام عمر كنيسةكم

مَاءُ يُوَكْدَا أَلْغَمَارْ إِنْ تَمَزْدَجَاوِينْ نَوَانْ <mād yūkda alḡamar ?in tamazdīgā nawan>

Ma-d yogda ālḡamār ən tāmazdīgā-nāwān? ‘How old is your mosque?’

269. Who was the first Bishop of this place?¹²⁰

من كان اول سقف¹²¹ هذا المكان (Who was the first roof of this place?)

مَا يَمُوشْ وَأَيُّوْتْنْ ءَجَائِدْ لِيْ وَءِءْ <mā yamūs wāywattan daḡā yadag

119 Vowels uncertain; presumably a verbal noun from a cognate of Niger Tamajeq *iṣu/išet* ‘be, identify with, conform to’.

120 Skipped in ms: How far does your diocese extend?; How many churches are in your diocese?; Under whose patriarchate is this?; The patriarch of Antioch.

121 Ms substitutes *saqf* ‘roof’ for unfamiliar *usquf* ‘bishop’.

wāday>

Ma yāmos wa iwātān dāḡa¹²² y ādāg wadāḡ? 'Who forged the ceiling for this place?'

270. How are your clergy educated?¹²³

كيف كهنتكم يتعلمون (How do your priests/soothsayers study?)

إِيمِيسَخَرَانَوْنِ مِيتَنِ إِيْسَلْمَادَنِ <ṭimissaxxarannawan mitan ṭissal-madan>

Imāssexxārān-nāwān mi-tān issalmadān? 'Your magicians, who teaches them?'

271. What are the points of difference between you and the Romish church?

ما هي الفروقات ما بينكم وبين كنيسة رومية

مَآ يَمُوسُ إِيْزَمَزَي نَوْنِ اءِ تَمَزْدِيْجَ تَالُرُومُ <mā yamūs ṭizamzay nawan 'd tamazdiḡa nalrrūm>

Ma yāmos izamməzay-nāwān əd tāməzdiḡa n Ārrum? 'What are your differences with the mosque of Rome?'

272. What are your doctrines of faith?

ما هي قواعد ايمانكم

مَآ مُوسْنَتُ تِيْجَاتَوَيْنِ نَظْكَطَانَوْنِ <mā mūsnaṭ tiḡattawīn naḡakḡanawan>

Ma mosnāt tiḡəttewen n āḡāḡḡān-nāwān? 'What are the pillars of your faith?'

273. In what light do you regard good works?

ما هو الفكر عندكم عن الاعمال الصالحة

مَآ يَمُوسُ أَمِيْڊْرَانِ نِ الْغِيْتَانِ <mā yamūs ʔamiḍrān 'n ḡītan 'lāḡnīn>

Ma yāmos āmeḍran ən ḡitān olaḡnen? 'What is the thought of good deeds?'

274. Do you believe in purgatory?¹²⁴

هل تعتقدون بمطهر (Do you believe in a purifier?)

تَفْلَاسَمُ أَوْيِ يَزَزْجَنُ <taflāsam ʔaway yazazḡan>

Təflasām awa yəzazḡān? 'Do you believe in what purifies?'

122 Cf. Nehlil: *tadadja* 'plafond'. The missing *ta-* is puzzling.

123 Skipped in ms: Do you use the Nicene creed?

124 Skipped in ms: It is deplorable to see Christians divided into so many sects.

275. God grant union.

فليعطني الله الاتفاق
 ʔihanaɣd yakf masīnaɣ tassāq<
 E-hanāɣ-d yakf Māss-ināɣ tassaqq. 'May God give us unity.'

276. We like to be united with you.

نحن نرغب الاتفاق معكم
 narā tassāq nawan<
 Nāra tassaqq-nāwān. 'We want your unity.'

277. What catechism do you use?

ما هو كتاب تعليم المسيحي عندكم
 (What is the book of teaching of
 the Christian among you?)
 mā yamūs mūsnaṭ nālkitāb
 nālmāsīx ɣūrwan<
 Ma yāmos musnāt n ālkətab n ālmāsex ɣor-wān? 'What is the
 knowledge of the book of the Messiah among you?'

278. How many sacraments do you hold?¹²⁵

كم هي الاسرار عندكم
 (How many are the secrets among you?)
 māḍ yūkda itīdawīt ɣūrwan<
 Ma-d yogda i tādawit ɣor-wān? 'What is it equal to for happi-
 ness¹²⁶ among you?'

279. Do you preach in the churches?

هل تعظوا بالكنائس
 tilmāḍan mānawan ḍaɣ ti-
 mazdiḡāwīn<
 Təlmaḍām man-nāwān ḍaɣ tāmazdiḡawen? 'Have you
 preached(?)¹²⁷ yourselves in the mosques?'

280. I hope you will preach the love of Christ.

ان شا الله بتوعظ محبه المسيح
 ʔin šāllahi ʔīdlmāḍan astara
 nālmāsīx<

125 Skipped in ms: Are the Holy Scriptures read by your people?; Are you at liberty to exercise your religion?

126 Arabic ʔasrār 'secrets, sacraments' was evidently mistaken for a derivative of srr 'rejoice'.

127 No such meaning has been observed in dictionaries consulted, and the apparent reflexive poses difficulties for interpretation.

Inša||ah ed-əlmăḍān əs tǎra n ălmăsex. 'Inshallah they will preach(?) the love of the Messiah.'

281. I want to see your church.

انا اريد انظر كنيسةكم
 <rīḡ asawāḍ ḍay tamazdīḡanawan>
 Reḡ asāwāḍ ḍay tāmazdīḡa-nāwān. 'I want to look in your mosque.'

282. Good bye!¹²⁸

خاطرکم
 <sā'lxīr yā>
 S ălxer ya. 'With goodness.'

(Dialogue 16: Discourse with a Governor-General or a Pasha)

283. I come to solicit your Highness's protection.

انا ملتمس حماية من سعادتک
 <narā takāḡt ḍay tabaḡūrtannak>
 Nāra taggaḡt ḍay tābāḡort-ənnāk. 'I want protection from your fortune.'

284. We are English.

نحن انكليز
 <nakanīḍ ʔankalīz>
 Nākkāneḍ Ənkəliz. 'We are English.'

285. We come from Constantinople.

نحن جايين من اسلامبول
 <nakanīḍ aṣṭānbūl ʔidnaqal>
 Nākkāneḍ Aṣṭāmbul e-d nāqqāl. 'We arrived from Istanbul.'

286. We have a firman from the Sultan.

نحن بيدنا فرمان من السلطان
 <nakanīḍ talā ḡurnay tasaflast namanūkal>
 Nākkāneḍ tāla ḡor-nāḡ tasəfləst n ămənokāl. 'We have a letter of safe passage of the king.'

287. We want to travel through Syria.

نحن قصدنا سافر بر الشام
 <nakanīḍ narā ʔasīkal ḍay aṣ-šām>

128 Same as nos. 29, 199, and 214.

Nākkāneḍ nāra asikəl dəy ʾāššam.

<p. 17 = Kayat 1844, p. 72-76>

74

288. By Your Highness's good will we can travel every where in safety.

من سعادتك نحن يمكننا نساfer في كل مكان بامان
دُعْ تَبْعُورْتَنَّاكْ إِدْ نَسَاكَلْ نَفْلَاشْ دَغْ أَكْمُوشْ أَدْكَ
<duḡ tabayūrtannak ʾid nasākal naflāš daḡ akamūs ddak>

Dəy tābāyort-ənnāk ed nəsakal nəflas dəy ak āmos ādāgg. 'In your fortune, we shall travel safely in every place.'

289. We have a letter from of His Highness the grand vizier to Your Highness

معنا خط من الصدر الاعظم لسعادتك
يَكِيصْ نَكْنِيضْ إِلَّا مُورْتَنُغْ أَكْتَابْ إِدْ قَلْنْ وَآ مَقَرْنْ إِيكِيكَ
<nakanīḍ illā yūrnay akatāb iddfaln wā maqaran īkīkad>

Nākkāneḍ illa yor-nāy ākātab i-d yāflān(?)¹²⁹ wa māqqārān i kīkad(?)¹³⁰. 'We have a writing which left(?) the great one for (happiness?)'

290. We beg your Highness to give us a general order to all the governors of different places.

نحن نلتمس من سعادتك متسلمين البلاد
نَكْنِيضْ نَرَادْ دَغْ تَبْعُورْتَنَّاكْ تَأْفَلَسْتُ دَغْ أَكَلْ
<nakanīḍ narāday tabayūratannak tāflast daḡ ʾakal>

Nākkāneḍ nāra dəy tabāyort-ənnāk tafləst dəy ākal. 'We want from your fortune trust in the land.'

291. Shall we require an escort?

نحن يلزمنا غفريوافقنا
<ʾilzāmanay ʾīrad nadīw>

Ilzam-anāy ere-d nāddew? 'Do we need someone who we would accompany?'

292. This is a fine country.

هذه بلاد جميلة

129 The proposed reading is hard to reconcile with the transcription, but does fit one meaning of the Arabic (*šdr* 'export').

130 This looks like an internal plural in the construct state, but no suitable word has been observed; based on the Arabic one would expect the meaning 'happiness'.

- أَكَلْ يَلَاغَنْ <?akal yulāyan>
Ākal yolaḡān. 'A good country.'
293. It wants good roads.
يلزمها طرقاات سهله
إِلَّا إِبْرَقَاتَنْ تَحِيلْنِين <?illā ibaraqātan nahīlnīn>
Illa¹³¹ ibārāqqaten nāhilnen. 'It needs easy roads.'
294. All prosperity to the nation comes from good laws.
كل توفيق الشعب ياتي من الشريعة العادلة
تَنْهِيلُ إِنْ بَرَقَاتَنْ تَلِيلُ مُظْلَتْ <tanhīl ?in baraqātan talīl muḡlat>
Tənhəle n bārāqqaten tāllil muḡlāt. 'Ease of roads follows straightness.'
295. Good government is the foundation
الحكم العادل هو الأساس
أَمْنُوْكَلْ إِيْمْدَالَنْ أَنْتَ أَلْسَخْ <?amanūkāl ?iḡdālan anta 'ssax>
Amənokāl iḡdalān ənta əssəx. 'A just king is the main thing.'
296. Please God, through you the country will prosper.
انشا الله بنظركم البلاد تنجم
إِنْ شَا اللّٰهُ سَاهَنَآيْنَاوَانْ ؟ِيْد نَارْبَاخْ <?in šā llahu sāhanaynawan ?id narbax>
Inšāllāh s āhānay-nāwān ed nārbāx. 'Inshallah by your vision we will prosper.'
297. Every one ought to be equal in the right of the law.
كل واحد واجب يكون مساوي بنظر الشرع
أَكْمُوْشْ إِيْتْ يُوْفْ إِسْوَاْمَرْ دَغْ أَلْشَّرِيْغْ <?akamūs ?iyyan yūf ?iswāḡ day aššarīḡa>
Ak āmos əyyān yuf iswāḡ dāḡ āššāreḡa. 'Everyone is better when(?) he has looked¹³² at the law.'
298. Schools will do your country much good.¹³³
مدارس تنفع بلادكم جدا
إِيْدَاكَّانْ مُسْنَتْ إِنْفَانْ أَكَلْ نَوْنْ هُولَنْ <?idakkan musnat ?infān akal nawan hūlan>
Idāggān n musnāt ənfān ākal-nāwān hullan. 'Places of knowledge have helped your country a lot.'

131 Cf. the usage of this existential verb to mean 'should' in Mali Tuareg: *wār-has talla tekle* 'He should not go.'

132 The syntax of this phrase is not entirely clear to the editors.

133 Skipped: Printing-presses will promote many blessings.

299. This man has insulted me.

هذا الرجل تعدى علي
 ʔalas wāday iʒlamī>
 Aləs wadäy iʒlam-i. 'This man has wronged me.'

300. This man has robbed me.

هذا الرجل سرقني
 ʔalas wāday yūkārī>
 Aləs wadäy yokär-i. 'This man has robbed me.'

301. What is the population of this country?

كام عدد اناس هاء البلاد
 māḍ ʔukwdan¹³⁴ adunat nakāl wāday>
 Ma-d ogdan äddunät n äkal wadäy? 'What are the people of this country equal to?'

302. We beg leave.

بازن سعادتك (By permission of your fortune)
 asmūrajat an tabayūrtannak>
 Əs morağät ən tabäyort-ənnäk. 'By the permission of your fortune.'

(Dialogue 17: With an Eastern Lady)

303. Good morning, madam!

صباح الخير يا ست
 tufat nālxīr ʔitātūfat>
 Tufat n älxer i ta tufat. 'Good morning to the superior woman.'

304. I am glad to see an Eastern lady

انا مبسوط الذي نظرت ست شرقيه
 ʔadīwīx ʔasnay udamannan>
 Əddiwey əs nay¹³⁵ udəm-ənnäm. 'I am glad to see your face.'

305. The Syrian ladies are shut up in general.

ستات بر الشام على الاغلب مسكر عليهن
 tililattīn nāššām tajīt dasnat
 tamaqalqalat>

134 Probably accidental transposition of <w> and <k>

135 Evidently a verbal noun from 'see', but one would have expected *ahānay*, as in nos. 215, 296, so the morphology is unclear.

Tilillaten n Āššam tāğğit d-əsnāt tāmāḡālyālt¹³⁶. 'The noble-women of Syria, seclusion(?) is frequent among them.'

306. Do you read?

انت بتقرى

تريد تيعرِمِيع <tarīd tīḡarimīy>

Tāred teḡāre mey? 'Do you want to read?'

307. We hear that the females are not taught to read in the East.

نحن نسمع ان البنات لا يتعلمن القراءة بالشرق (We hear that girls do not learn to read in the east.)

نسل أن سان تيرَضِين وَزْ آسِنِيْث تِيْعَرِ نَمَشْرِق <nasal ʔan sān tībaraḍīn war assīnayt¹³⁷ tīḡari namašriq>

Nəsall ən san tibāraḍen wār əssennāt teḡāre n āmāšrəq. 'We hear that¹³⁸ girls do not know the reading of the East.'

<p. 19 = Kayat 1844, p. 76-81>

308. The Eastern ladies are very clever in needle-work.

ستات الشرق شاطرين في شغل الإبرة

شِيْثُ الْقَابِلَةُ ءَاسَانَتْ ءَاطَمِيْ هُوْلُنْ <šīt 'lqāblat ʔāsānnat ʔāzamay hūllan>

Šet ālqablāt əssannāt aẓāmay hullan. 'Eastern women know sewing a lot.'

309. The English ladies will do all they can to help the Eastern ladies.

ستات الانكليز يعملن كل ما يقدرن ليسعفن ستات الشرق

شِيْثُ اِنْكَلِيْزْ سَالْمَدْنَتْ شِيْثُ الشَّرْق <šīt ʔinkalīz sālmadnat šīt 'ššaraq>

Šet Ənkəliz salmadnāt šet āššārāq. 'English women teach Eastern women.'

310. The Eastern ladies are very handsome.

ستات الشرق جميلات جيّدًا

شِيْثُ الْقَابِلَةُ تِيْهْوَسِيْنِ هُوْلُنْ <šīt alqāblat tiyyahūsayni hūllan>

136 This word was not found in dictionaries examined, so its meaning and exact transcription is unclear.

137 Probably accidental transposition of <y> and <n>.

138 Exact syntax unclear to the editors, but cf. the relative head *ssan* in Prasse.

Šet älqablät ti ähossäyner¹³⁹ hullan. ‘Eastern women are very beautiful.’

311. We admire your costume.

نحن نستحلى لبسك

تَجْرَاطَنَعُ تَلَسِّي تَكْمَت <tağrāzanay talassī nnakmat>

Təğraṣ-anāy tälässe-nnākmät. ‘Your clothing pleases us.’

312. Will you allow me to look at your rings?

خليني انظر خواتمك

سَوْلَانْ اِيْدَنْيَغْ تِسْقِينَم <sūllān īdnayḡ tisqīnnam>

Sollan ed-nāyāḡ tisəḡen-nnām? ‘May I gently see your rings?’

313. Very pretty.¹⁴⁰

كثير ظريف

الْأَعْنَتْ هَوْلَنْ <ulāynat hūllan>

Olaynät hullan. ‘They are very good.’

314. Mothers, in England, instruct their daughters to read.

الإمهات في بلاد الانكليز يعلمون بناتهن القراءة

تِيضِيصِيْنْ تَكْلِيْزْ سَاغْرِيْنَتْ اِشْتَسْنَتْ <tīḏīḏayn naklīz sāḡrīnnat ḡiṣi-tasnat>

Tīḏeḏen n Əkliz saḡrenät i šet-əsnät. ‘The women of England teach their children to read.’

315. I hope you will teach your daughters to read.

العشم ان تعلم بناتك القراءة (The hope is that you teach your daughters reading).

تَانْفُسْتْ اِتْسَعْرَدْ اِيشِيْكَ <tānfust ḡidtasayrad ḡiṣīk>

Tanfust ed-tāsāḡräd i šš-ek. ‘The tale¹⁴¹ is that you should teach your daughters to read.’

316. This is a specimen of English ladies’ hand-work.

هَذَا مِنْ شَغْلِ اِيَادِي سَتِّتِ الْاِنْكَلِيْزِ

اَمْكُنُوْنْ اِنْفَاسَنْ شِيْثْ اِنْكَلِيْزْ <amaknūn ‘nfāsan šīt inkilīz>

Amākno n fassān n šet Ənkəlīz. ‘Hand-work of English women.’

(Dialogue 18: Discourse on Researches of Antiquities)

139 Here and in no. 154, it seems that the second of a final sequence of two <n>’s has been haplologized.

140 Skipped in ms: Please, madam.; Have the goodness, madam.

141 The meaning does not seem to match the Arabic.

317. What are the principal tribes that inhabit this region?
 ما هم القبائل سكان هذ الارض
 <māmūsnaṭ tiwsātīn tītazaynīn
 ʔakal wāday>
 Ma mosnāt tawsaten ti tazzāḡnen ākal wadāḡ? 'What are the tribes that inhabit this land?'
318. Of what tribe are they branches?
 من اي قبيله هم (They are of which tribe?)
 <ʔamūsān daḡ taw'satīn>
 Āmosān dāḡ tawsaten. 'They are in tribes.'
319. What tribe is this?
 من هو اهل هاء الربع (Who are the people of this quarter?)
 <māmūsān kīl adak wāday>
 Ma mosān kel ādāḡ wadāḡ? 'What are the people of this place?'
320. Are there in this neighbourhood any remains of ancient cities, temples, or castles?
 هل موجود في هل القرب اثار بلدان قديمه \ ام هياكم ام حصون
 <ʔisaḡlay nakāl> إِيسْغَلَي نَكَالْ وَاغْ هَانْتْ حَرْمَانْ أَرْوِينْ \ إِكَنْ نَسْنْ نَاشْ
 wāday hānt ɣarmān ʔarūnīn ʔidakan nasān ɣās>
 Isāḡlay n ākal wadāḡ han-t ɣārman ārəwnen \ Idāḡān-nāsān ɣas?
 'The surroundings of this place, are there ancient cities in it? \ Their places only.'
321. Are there any ancient columns?
 هل موجود عواميد قديمه
 <warnasīn hānatan tiḡatawwīn arūnīn>
 Wār nassen hanāt-tān tēḡāttawen ārəwnen. 'We do not know if there are ancient pillars in them.'
322. Is there any thing else of ancient monuments?
 هل يوجد غير فرج قديمه
 <ḡārawnāt dasan tibūdāwīn arūnīn>
 Ḡārāwnāt d-āsān tiboḡawen ārəwnen? 'Do they find in them ancient monuments'¹⁴²?
323. Are there any ancient inscriptions?
 هل يوجد كتابة قديمه على صخور ام حجار (Is there old writing on rocks or stones?)

142 Word not found in sources examined, so the exact sense is uncertain.

جَارُون دَسْن كَتَابْ أَرُونِينْ دَغْ تَهُونْ مِيعْ إِبْلَالْنْ <ġārawnāt dasan katāb arūnīn dāy tahūn mīy ʔiblālān>
 Ġarrāwnāt d-əsān kətab ārəwnnen dāy təhun mey iblalān? ‘Do they find in them ancient writings on rocks or stones?’

324. Are there any ancient figures?

هَلْ يُوْجِدْ تَصَاوِيرْ قَدِيمَه
 جَارُونْتْ دَسْن مَسْكَنَانْ أَرُونِينْ <ġārawnāt dasan masaknān arūnīn>
 Ġarrāwnāt d-əsān māsāknan ārəwnnen? ‘Do they find in them ancient images?’

325. Have you any ancient medals of gold, or silver, or copper?

هَلْ عِنْدَكُم سِلَاحِيَّتْ قَدِيمَه مِنْ دَهَبْ أَمْ فِضَه أَمْ مِنْ نَاحِسْ
 تَلَامْ تَظُولْ تَرُوْتْ نُوْرَغْ مِيعْ أَظْرَفْ مِيعْ دَاوُوعْ <talām tazūli taruwwat nūray mīy azraf mīy dārūy>
 Təlam təzoli tārəwāt n orāy mey azrəf mey daroy? ‘Do you have any old metal of gold or silver or copper?’

326. Have you any ancient manuscripts?

عِنْدَكُم كُتُبْ قَدِيمَه
 تَلَامْ الْكُتَابْنْ أَرُونِينْ <talām 'lkatāban arūnīn>
 Təlam əlkətabān ārəwnnen? ‘Do you have ancient books?’

<p. 20 = Kayat 1844, p. 81>

327. Are there any old books of the Arabians?

هَلْ يُوْجِدْ كُتُبْ عَرَبِيَّةْ مِنْ أَقْوَالِ الْعَرَبِ الْقَدَمَا
 تَلَامْ الْكُتَابْنْ تَارَبْتْ نَاوَلْ أَوُوْ يَرِينْ <talām 'lkatāban tārabt nāwal anwa yurinīn>
 Təlam əlkətabān n tarābt n awal ən wa yorānen? ‘Do you have books of Arabic of the speech of the ancients?’

328. Are there among you any who read these characters?

هَلْ يُوْجِدْ بَيْنَكُم مَن يَقْرَأُ هَٰذِهِ الْاِحْرَفْ
 تَلَامْ إِيرِهِيْنِيْ يَافْرِيْنْ إِلَافْنْ وَادَغْ <talām ʔirihinyayrīn ʔilāffan wāday>
 Təlam ere-hin yāğren ilaffān wadāy? ‘Do you have anyone who would read me these letters?’

“Done at Ghat, by Mohammed the Shereef, nephew of Haj Ahmed, the Governor of the town of Ghat; 24 July 1850. James Richardson.”

Bibliography

- Adam, Salah. *A sociolinguistic investigation of language shift among Libyan Tuareg: The case of Ghat and Barkat*. PhD thesis, University of Essex, 2017. <http://repository.essex.ac.uk/22318/>
- Adam, Salah. "Multiple attitudes and shifting language ideologies: a case of language shift among Libyan Tuaregs." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 278 (2022), pp. 229–258. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2022-0012>
- Barth, Henry. *Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa: Being a Journal of an Expedition Under the Auspices of H.B.M.'s Government, In the Years 1849-1855*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1857.
- Benkato, Adam. "Towards an account of historical new-dialect formation in northern Africa: The case of sibilant merging in Arabic dialects." In *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics XXXIV*, edited by Mahmoud Azaz, 13–32. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sal.12.01ben>
- Benmofteh, Najah & Christophe Pereira. "Les futurs en arabe de Tripoli (Libye): temporalité, aspectualité et modalités." In *Studies on Arabic Dialectology and Sociolinguistics: Proceedings of the 12th International Conference of AIDA held in Marseille from May 30th to June 2nd 2017*, edited by Catherine Miller, Alexandrine Baroncini, Marie-Aimée Germanos, Jairo Guerrero & Christophe Pereira. Aix-en-Provence: IREMAM, 2018. <https://books.openedition.org/iremam/4869>
- Benton, Philip A. *The Languages and Peoples of Bornu*. London: Frank Cass & Co, 1968.
- Biagetti, Stefano, Ali Ait Kaci & Savino di Lernia. "The "written landscape" of the central Sahara: recording and digitising the Tifnagh inscriptions in the Tadrart Acacus mountains." In *From Dust to Digital: Ten Years of the Endangered Archives Programme*, edited by Maja Kominko. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2015, pp. 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0052>
- Delheure, Jean. "Grammaire de la teggargrent (berbère parlé à Ouargla)," *Études et Documents Berbères* 42 (2019), pp. 45–142.
- Freeman, Stanhope. *A Grammatical Sketch Of The Temahuq or Towarek Language*. London: Harrison & Sons, 1861.
- de Foucauld, Charles E. *Dictionnaire touareg-français: dialecte de*

- l'Ahaggar*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale de France, 1951.
- Heath, Jeffrey. *Dictionnaire Touareg du Mali: tamachek-anglais-français*. Paris: Karthala, 2006.
- Kayat, Assaad Yakoob. *The Eastern Traveller's Interpreter; Or, Arabic Without a Teacher*. London: James Madden and Co, 1844.
- Kohl, Ines. *Tuareg in Libyen. Identitäten zwischen Grenzen*. Berlin: Reimer, 2007.
- Kossmann, Maarten. "Le futur à Ghadamès et l'origine de la conjugaison verbale en berbère." In *Études berbères et chamito-sémitiques: Mélanges offerts à Karl-G. Prasse*, edited by Salem Chaker & Andrzej Zaborski. Paris: Peeters, 2000, pp. 237–255.
- Kossmann, Maarten. "Three irregular Berber verbs: 'eat', 'drink', 'be cooked, ripen'." In *Evidence and Counter-Evidence. Essays in Honour of Frederik Kortlandt*, edited by Alexander Lubotsky, Jos Schaecken, & Jeroen Wiedenhof, Vol. 2. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008, pp. 225–236.
- Kossmann Maarten. "La flexion du prétérit d'état en berbère: questions de morphologie comparée." In *Études de phonétique et linguistiques berbères: Hommage à Naïma Louali (1961-2005)*, edited by Salem Chaker, Amina Mettouchi, & Gérard Philippson. Paris/Louvain: Peeters, 2009, pp. 155–176.
- Kossmann, Maarten. *A Grammar of Ayer Tuareg (Niger)*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe, 2011.
- Kossmann, Maarten & Ramada Elghamis. "Preliminary notes on Tuareg in Arabic script from Niger." In *The Arabic Script in Africa. Studies in the Use of a Writing System* (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 71), edited by Meikal Mumin & C.H.M. Versteegh. Leiden: Brill, 2014, pp. 79–89.
- Krause, Gottlob A. *Proben der Sprache von Ghat in der Sahara: mit haussanischer und deutscher Übersetzung*. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1884.
- N Hlīl, Muḥammad (tr. ṢAbd Allāh Ṣāw). *Dirāsāt fī lahjat Ghāt: Dirāsa naḥwiyya fī t-tanawwuṣ al-lughawiyy li-Amāzīgh Ghāt* (Manshūrāt Muṭassasat Tāwālt al-thaqāfiyya silsilat lisāniyyāt 5). Muṭassasat Tāwālt al-thaqāfiyya, 2003.
- Nehliil, Mohammed. *Étude sur le dialecte de Ghat*. Paris: Leroux, 1909.
- Newman, Francis W. *Libyan Vocabulary. An Essay Towards Reproducing*

- the Ancient Numidian Language Out of Four Modern Tongues*. London: Trübner & Co, 1882.
- Prasse, Karl-G. *Manuel de grammaire touaregue (tahăggart) I-III, Phonétique - Ecriture - Pronom*. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen, 1972.
- Prasse, Karl-G. "New Light on the Origin of the Tuareg Vowels E and O." In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Hamito-Semitic Congress. Vol I: Hamito-Semitic, Berber, Chadic*, edited by Hans Mukarovsky. Vienna: Afro-Pub, 1990, pp. 163–170.
- Prasse, Karl-G. "Renseignements sur le touareg de Djanet (Algérie)." In *Mélanges David Cohen: études sur le langage, les langues, les dialectes, les littératures, offertes par ses élèves, ses collègues, ses amis.*, edited by Jérôme Lentin & Antoine Lonnet. Paris: Maisonneuve & Larose, 2003, pp. 527-536.
- Prasse, Karl-G. *Tuareg Elementary Course (Tahăggart)*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe, 2010.
- Prasse, Karl-G., Ghoubeïd Alojaly, & Ghabdouane Mohamed. *Lexique touareg-français*, 2nd edition. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 1998.
- Richardson, James. *Touarick Alphabet, with the corresponding Arabic and English Letters*. London: T. J. Harrison, 1847.
- Richardson, James. *Travels in the great desert of Sahara, in the years of 1845 and 1846. Containing a narrative of personal adventures during a tour of nine months through the desert amongst the Touaricks and other tribes of Saharan people; including a description of the cases and cities of Ghat, Ghadames and Mourzuk*. London: Richard Bentley, 1848.
- Richardson, James. *Narrative of a Mission to Central Africa Performed in the Years 1850-51, Under the Orders and at the Expense of Her Majesty's Government*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1853.
- Saa, Fouad. *Quelques aspects de la morphologie et de la phonologie d'un parler amazighe de Figuig*. Rabat: IRCAM, 2010.
- Sigwarth, G. *Le palmier à Djanet: Étude linguistique* (Monographies régionales 1). Algiers: Institut de recherches sahariennes, n.d. [1953].
- Souag, Lameen. "Sokna re-examined: Two unedited Sokna Berber vocabularies from 1850." In *Quaderni di Studi Berberi e Libico-Berberi*

4: *La lingua nella vita e la vita della lingua. Itinerari e percorsi degli studi berberi*, edited by Anna Maria di Tolla. Naples: UNIOR, 2015, pp. 179–206.

- 84 Souag, Lameen. “Le parler berbère de Sokna (Libye) à la lumière de nouvelles données”. *Études et Documents Berbères* 37/1 (2017), pp. 193–203.

Methods and Sources for a New Generation of Libyan Studies: A Roundtable

Much of the scholarship focused on Libya was long dominated by two general directions: an archeological orientation toward the ancient past on the one hand, and a concern with Muammar Gaddafi's contentious relationships with Western powers on the other. Both directions belied colonial logics for knowledge production. The former could inform notions of Euro-Mediterranean heritage; the latter lent itself to discussions oriented around prescriptions for US foreign policy. Since 2011, the field has broadened, and a new generation of scholars are rethinking earlier work, embracing interdisciplinarity and new methods, and tackling understudied areas.

It was with this situation in mind that we convened virtually at the Middle East Studies Association's annual meeting on October 7th, 2020 to ask: where is Libyan studies today? Where might and should it go from here? The contributions published here are adapted and expanded from the remarks made by most of the participants of that discussion. They underscore the challenges to conducting research in and on Libya, which remain numerous, but they also highlight the prospects for doing so in innovative ways that push the boundaries of region and discipline. Shared across the contributions is a sense of urgency for the work needed, which suggests a kind of anxiety over the possible relationship between the dire situation of Libyan studies and that of Libya. All authors also offer direct or indirect answers to the oft-posed question – “but isn't Libya inaccessible for research?” – suggesting both practical routes to access archives and a critique of the epistemology and politics that produce the question itself.

Adam Benkato examines the history of research on Libyan languages, suggesting how a range of variously unused and underused archives offer a wealth of data to take up, and calling for collaborations between scholars in Western institutions and language activ-

ists in Libya to counter colonial approaches to language, identity, and indigeneity. Fathia Elmenghawi reflects on her experience conducting doctoral research in and on public spaces in Tripoli, paying particular attention to the gendered dimensions of both the site and the research endeavor. Asma Khalifa explores the ethics and politics of undertaking field research in Libya, drawing on her own experience adapting to shifting constraints. My contribution rounds out the discussion of fieldwork, surveying the politics of ethnography in Libya to argue for the task of writing Libya back into relation and back into the world. Amina Zarrugh makes an urgent call to sociology, exposing the need to make Libya epistemologically legible in order to open the path for nuanced, micro-level studies across a range of contexts, embracing new methods along the way. Each contribution illustrates the significant impact that a rigorous, historicized, and contextualized focus on Libya is poised to make across a range of (inter)disciplinary conversations.



تبيّن كل المساهمات ما قد يكون للتركيز على دراسة ليبيا بشكل دقيق وتاريخي وواضح السياق من تأثير مهم على تشكيلة واسعة من النقاشات ضمن التخصصات البحثية المختلفة.



مناهج ومصادر لجيل جديد من الدراسات الليبية*

٨٨

لطالما سيطر على الدراسات الخاصة بليبيا اتجاهان رئيسيان: التنقيب الأثري الخاص بالتاريخ القديم من جهة، وعلاقة معمر القذافي الجذلية بالغرب من جهة أخرى. يكتِّب الاتجاهان المنطق الاستعماري المتعلق بنتائج المعرفة، ففيما قد يمنح الاتجاه الأول انطباعات عن إرث أوروبي-متوسطي، يفسح الاتجاه الثاني المجال لنقاشات تتمحور حول كيفية إرشاد سياسة الولايات المتحدة الخارجية. بدأت آفاق المجال تتوسع منذ عام 2020، وأخذ جيل جديد من الباحثين يعيد التفكير بالدراسات السابقة، فتبنّوا مذاهب جديدة متعددة التخصصات وتطرقوا إلى مواضيع لم تُدرس بشكل كافٍ من قبل.

أخذنا هذا الوضع بعين الاعتبار حين عقدنا اجتماعاً افتراضياً ضمن فعاليات المؤتمر السنوي لجمعية دراسات الشرق الأوسط في السابع من أكتوبر ٢٠٢٠ وطرحنا السؤال التالي: ما حال الدراسات الليبية في الحاضر؟ ما عساها تكون أو ما يجب أن تكون الخطوات القادمة؟ المشاركات التي ننشرها هاهنا تمثل تعديلاً وتوسيعاً للمحاضرات التي ألقاها المشاركون في حلقة الحوار. تشهد هذه المشاركات على التحديّات التي تحيط بإجراء الأبحاث عن ليبيا وفيها، وهي تحديات جمة، لكنها توفّر كذلك الآفاق المحتملة لهذه الدراسات بأساليب مميّزة تتحدى حدود المنطقة ومجال الدراسات الليبية. يجمع المشاركات المختلفة حسّ بالضرورة الملحة للعمل المطلوب، ويعكس القلق الذي تثيره العلاقة المحتملة بين الوضع المزري للدراسات الليبية ووضع ليبيا نفسها. يجيب جميع النقاد كذلك بشكل مباشر أو غير مباشر على السؤال الذي يُطرح مراراً وتكراراً، ألا وهو "ولكن أليس العمل البحثي في ليبيا مستحيلًا؟" فيقترحون في إجاباتهم سؤالاً عملياً للوصول إلى الأرشيفات الليبية إضافة إلى انتقاد الإبستمولوجيات والمعتقدات التي تطرح سؤالاً كهذا بالأساس.

يتمتع آدم بن كاطو في تاريخ الدراسات حول اللغات الليبية، فيبين لنا ما توفّره الأرشيفات التي قلّما استُخدمت أو لم تُستخدم أبداً من المعلومات الغنية للراغبين بدراساتها، ويناشد بالتعاون بين الباحثين في المؤسسات الغربية وناشطي اللغات في ليبيا لمحاربة المقاربات الاستعمارية للغة والهوية والأصليّة. تتطرق فتحة المنقاي إلى تجربتها كطالبة دكتوراه تُجري أبحاثاً عن الأماكن العامة في طرابلس وفيها، وتركز خصوصاً على الأبعاد الجندرية للمكان والعمل البحثي معاً. تستكشف أسماء خليفة الآداب والسياسات التي تلعب دوراً في الاضطلاع بالعمل البحثي في ليبيا، مشيرة إلى تجربتها الشخصية وهي تتأقلم مع القيود المتقلبة. تتّوَج مساهمتي النقاش حول العمل الميداني إذ أعان سياسات علم وصف الشعوب في ليبيا بغرض المطالبة بمهمة إعادة كتابة ليبيا كجزء من عالمنا هذا. تطلق أمينة الزروق نداءً عاجلاً للعاملين في مجال الدراسات المجتمعية إذ تعرض لنا ضرورة جعل ليبيا مقروءة على الصعيد الإبستمولوجي بهدف إفساح المجال أمام دراسات دقيقة تتبنى مذاهب جديدة للبحث في سياقات مختلفة. بذلك

Research on Language in Libya

The languages of Libya figure only infrequently in scholarship which addresses languages of the MENA region in general, be it in the areas of dialectology, sociolinguistics, language contact, language policy, discourse analysis, or nearly anything else. Although recent research is now slowly beginning to change this status for the better, there are only a few scholars currently working on languages of Libya, and the possibilities and potential of such work are often left out of discussions of research on Libya more generally. I thus have several goals in this roundtable contribution: to survey existing scholarship on languages and linguistics in Libya, to situate the discipline regionally, to point to ways scholars can contribute despite the current situation of the country, and to discuss some institutional and research politics.

As a Libyan-American, I am one of a small number of active scholars with personal and family ties to Libya, and one of even fewer based in a Western institution, who work on linguistics of a Libyan language. In the last decade or so, it is only those of us with such ties who have been able to carry out fieldwork in the country. When I first began research on Libyan Arabic, and then also Amazigh, now over a decade ago, it quickly became clear to me how few linguists were actively working on Libya in general, and how little information about Libyan languages was available in the scholarly literature. I have tried to remedy this by collaboration and communication between currently active scholars, and by sharing with the public a comprehensive bibliography I have been compiling and updating regularly for a few years.¹ But much more needs to be done, including forging closer links among scholars and language activists, in publishing in accessible ways, and

1 Adam Benkato, "Bibliography of Libyan Languages," <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1BgFoltQrQqqkpROTNmBFY0vwIC42DG59QOt-j4xs-5E/>.

in mentoring new generations of scholars.

The total of my bibliography of Libyan languages is just under 400 items. This may sound like a lot, but its scope is quite broad, including materials such as colonial notices about language, self-published language manuals, travelogues containing language observations (many of which would not be viewed as typical scholarly sources, or prove all that useful for research), besides a number of unpublished PhD and MA theses. Even then, the total is only a fraction of that for any other northern African or Arabic-speaking country. And in fact, the vast majority of reliable linguistic work has come in the last decade or so and is due almost entirely, with a few exceptions, to a small number of scholars (including Libyan graduate students) working at Western institutions.

This piece cannot be comprehensive—readers are referred to the online bibliography for additional references—and so will attempt to give a broad overview by language before briefly examining the history of the scholarship on Libyan languages.

To begin, working our way from least-studied to most, there is firstly Tebu, specifically the Tedaga variety, spoken in southern Libya and extending into Chad and Niger. There had been no scholarly studies on Libyan Tebu (Tedaga) anywhere, until the last years, in which a few works have appeared in Arabic in Libya, published by Tebu scholars and activists.²

Tuareg then, often considered socio-politically as a separate language variety, is part of the Berber language family and spoken throughout southwestern Libya. It is part of a vast language area, stretching from its easternmost regions in Libya all the way west to Mali. A Libyan variety of Tuareg had not been studied since the 1800s, until a recent PhD dissertation by a Libyan student.³

2 For example, Ḥasan Badī Muḥammad Kadīno, *al-Tabu: Tarīkh-hum wa-luġat-hum wa-thaqāfat-hum* (Ṭarābulus: al-Jamʿiyya al-Lībiyya li-l-Thaqāfa al-Tibāwiyya, 2021); id., *Taʿallum al-luġa al-tibāwiyya / Ka tudaga-ā sihik* (Ṭarābulus: al-Jamʿiyya al-Lībiyya li-l-Thaqāfa al-Tibāwiyya, 2021); id., *Lisān al-tabu: Muʿjam tibāwī-ʿarabī / Tirmesu Tudaa-ā: Mēde Tūgi tudagaa arangaa* (Ṭarābulus: al-Jamʿiyya al-Lībiyya li-l-Thaqāfa al-Tibāwiyya, 2021).

3 Salah Adam, *A Sociolinguistic Investigation of Language Shift Among Libyan Tuareg: The Case of Ghat and Barkat* (University of Essex PhD Thesis, 2017).

The other varieties of Berber in Libya are as follows: an endangered variety is spoken in Awjila, probably extinct ones in Sokna, and El-Fogaha, and flourishing though threatened ones in the Jabal Nafusa, Zwara, and Ghadames. For all these, too, most studies are quite old, with recent studies based almost entirely on old texts, excepting a few unpublished studies by Libyan graduate students and the work of Libyan scholar-activists.

Arabic, the majority language of Libya, has benefited from many studies, though these are restricted geographically, socially, and in methodology. They cover mostly just the Arabic of Tripoli and to a lesser extent of Benghazi, with studies here and there on other locations, including some work in diaspora. In comparison with the Arabic varieties of its neighbors, Libya as a whole remains thinly researched.

The history of research on Libyan languages differs slightly from that of its neighbors. As elsewhere, it really began in the colonial era. Almost exclusively Italian scholars or colonial officers wrote descriptions of Arabic or Berber, often oriented at the colonial military and administration, though also for general ‘scientific’ purposes. After Libyan independence, linguistic research by Italian scholars continued only in a few isolated cases, in contrast to neighboring French-occupied northern Africa where French scholars have worked continuously until now. Interestingly, it was mostly work on Libyan Berber, not Arabic, that continued in Italian institutions, though that is now beginning to change a little. In terms of students, in fact, the majority of those who have carried out graduate-level work on a Libyan language have been Libyan. Of the 50 PhD theses written on a language-related topic between 1972 and 2021, 48 have been by Libyans. The percentage is similar for MA theses.⁴ But, in most cases, these students have returned to Libya to teach at local institutions, and did not continue to publish their work.

All of Libya’s major languages, in their current as well as their historical versions, exist beyond the modern nation-state. The study of languages in Libya, similarly to that of its neighbors, thus has the potential to contribute significantly to regional knowledge. But unlike its neighbors, Libya’s uniqueness in not having a major colonial lan-

4 See Adam Benkato, “Dissertations on Libyan Languages,” <https://silphi-umgatherer.com/2020/06/01/dissertations-on-libyan-languages/>.

guage in continuous use means that language policy and multilingualism have followed—and can continue to follow—a different trajectory. Libya provides a complementary case study for the region, though one that has hardly been attended to.

The current situation in Libya—war, displacement, political stagnation, under-development—means that the usual form of Western-based linguistic research in the country is largely not possible, and not *necessarily* a priority from a Libyan perspective. As mentioned, only local scholars have been exceptions to this. In some of our work, though, gunshots or even bombs can be heard in the background of ‘linguistic’ recordings, in which participants discuss being affected by war. In an unfortunate parallel, many conversations in ‘linguistic’ recordings made in the 1940s are similarly about war, military training, or foreign intervention.

But “access” is not the solution, besides being a Western framing. Colonial-era scholarship had unfettered “access,” but colonial linguistic research is still beset with problems: coherent with colonial discourse, if not explicitly in favor of colonization,⁵ racial science, not to mention neglect of various other scholarly norms. And indeed, even then, a number of linguistic works were produced totally outside of the speech communities they studied.⁶

The fact that so many areas have been neglected means that scholars have a unique chance to shape fields of inquiry. Instead of trying to fill the “gaps” that Western knowledge production systems have identified, why not intentionally create new research paradigms, ask research questions of local relevance and concern, and make use of existing sources in new ways? Good and varied questions can only truly come about through imaginative collaboration between scholars, but there are plenty of places to begin.

Even without being able to access Libyan speech communities and archives, scholars have a wide range of invaluable existing material with historical linguistic and sociolinguistic potential. For example: the Arabic journal of 19th-century Tripolitanian notable Ḥasan al-Faḡīḥ

5 Such as a 1933 work on eastern Libyan Arabic which provides as a sample dialect text a long dialect *qaṣīda* in praise of Mussolini.

6 See Adam Benkato, “Non-site fieldwork on Libyan languages,” <https://silphiumgatherer.com/2020/06/13/nonsite-fieldwork-libya/>.

Ḥasan has the potential to shed a great deal of light on the dialect of Tripoli in the early modern period.⁷ Or, a private collection of family mercantile documents in Arabic from 19th-century Ghadames would illuminate language practices among a multilingual and transregional Amazigh community on the eve of colonialism.⁸ Both have been edited by Libyan scholars and available for many years, but have been neglected by linguists. Attentive analysis of such texts will provide perspectives on the social and historical linguistic landscapes of early modern and pre-colonial Libya, in addition to providing needed diachronic historical context for contemporary studies. As well, studies based on text corpora published by previous generations of (Western) linguists can still be productive, and indeed some recent such work has been able to make obscure data from Libyan Amazigh varieties more coherent and accessible.⁹

Scholars can also work on existing archival material and seek out hitherto unidentified archives. The copious oral history publications and documentation of the Libyan Studies Center are a prime example.

7 Ḥasan al-Fagīḥ Ḥasan, *al-Yawmiyyāt al-Lībīya*, 2 vols., ed. Muḥammad al-Uṣṭā and ‘Ammār Jaḥaydar (Tripoli: Markaz Jihād al-Lībīyīn li-l-Dirāsāt al-Tārikhīyah, 2001). Part of the text has been translated into Italian with philological comments, see Gioia Chiauzzi, “La spedizione di Napoli contro Tripoli d’occidente secondo il cronista tripolino Ḥasan al-Faqīḥ Ḥasan: Traduzione e osservazioni linguistiche,” *Studi Magrebini* 15 (1983), 75–153, 16 (1984), 91–178, 17 (1985), 57–96, 18 (1986), 69–90.

8 Bashīr Qāsim Yūsha’, *Ghadāmis: Wathā’iq tijāriyya ijtīmā’iyya 1228-1310 hijrī* (Ṭarābulus: Markaz Jihād al-Lībīyīn li-l-dirāsāt al-tārikhiyya, 1982). A German translation is available for some of these documents, see Ulrich Haarmann, *Briefe aus der Wüste: Die private Korrespondenz der in Ġadāmis ansässigen Yūša’-Familie*, ed. Stephan Conermann (Hamburg: EB-Verlag, 2008).

9 The recent grammars of the languages of Ghadames and Awjila are both based on materials gathered and published more than fifty years ago by European linguists working in Libya, see Maarten Kossmann, *A Grammatical Sketch of Ghadames Berber (Libya)* (Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe, 2013) and Marijn van Putten, *A Grammar of Awjila Berber (Libya): Based on Paradise’s Work* (Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe, 2014). Most recently see also Anna Maria Di Tolla & Valentina Schiattarella, “A Literary and Linguistic Analysis of Nafusi Berber Based on Past Works,” *Quaderni di Studi Berberi e Libico-Berberi* 7 (2020), 273–292.

In my own work, I recently tracked down a forgotten archive of voice recordings on 78rpm vinyl records made by British linguist T. F. Mitchell in Libya in 1948. My work on that archive has multiple dimensions, from its potential as the earliest corpus of Libyan dialect recordings to the light it sheds on the colonial and military power structures that enabled *in situ* research. The archives of other linguists from that era may still exist, particularly in Italy. Reaching back even further, the papers of a British traveller in the Sahara in the 1850s proved to contain the earliest external records of the Amazigh variety of Sokna and of a Libyan Tuareg variety.¹⁰ Even existing media sources, including social media—though not necessarily substitutes for on-site fieldwork in a speech community—may be fruitful given the right approach.¹¹

For the framing and situating of future work, however, the critical reanalysis of earlier research, particularly that produced in the colonial era, is essential.¹² We should investigate and critique the contexts and goals of colonial scholarship, while comparing the administrative and scholarly structures which enabled it with our own such structures. How did linguistic work serve colonial power? How did it reify or reinscribe colonial representations of the colonized populations? How have these representations gone unquestioned until now? Understanding such matters will no doubt help scholars, particularly Libyan ones, in understanding emerging forms of ethnic, cultural, and

10 Lameen Souag, “Sokna re-examined: Two unedited Sokna Berber vocabularies from 1850,” *Quaderni di Studi Berberi e Libico-Berberi* 4 (2015), 179–206. See also Souag and Benkato, this issue.

11 Marijn Van Putten & Lameen Souag, “Attrition and revival in Awjila Berber: Facebook posts as a new data source for an endangered language,” *Corpus* 14 (2015), 23–58. A recent study of Jewish Libyan Arabic varieties is based on social and private media recorded by community members in diaspora, Luca D’Anna, “The Judeo-Arabic Dialect of Yefren (Libya): Phonological and Morphological Notes,” *Journal of Jewish Languages* 9 (2021), 1–31.

12 On the impact of colonial knowledge on Arabic dialectology, see Adam Benkato, “From Medieval Tribes to Modern Dialects: On the Afterlives of Colonial Knowledge in Arabic Dialectology,” *Philological Encounters* 4/1-2 (2019), 2–25. On the production of Italian colonial knowledge generally, see Nicco A. La Mattina, “Writing Ottoman and Italian Colonial Libya: Intelligence Gathering and the Production of Colonial Knowledge,” *Hespéris-Tamuda* 55/2 (2020), 123–153.

regional identity in Libya and how they manifest in or with reference to language.

Finally, it must be admitted that all these concerns are, in some real sense, merely academic. To a certain extent, it is possible to work towards a more self-aware and nuanced scholarship even while having little to do with the actual speech communities we study. Hence, an important area where scholars can potentially make a productive contribution to Libyan society is in the area of language planning and policy.¹³ While scholars should follow the lead of activists, particularly those from minority communities, they can bring much comparative research and experience to this area.

More generally, Western institutions usually hold a near-monopoly on knowledge production, including in the realm of language, as this contribution being written in English demonstrates. We must intentionally break down this paradigm and work to collaborate with Libyan scholars in all areas. This involves using our institutional resources to invite both independent and institutionally-based scholars and activists to public forums,¹⁴ or directly collaborating with them in publications, as for example in the case of a recent grammar of a Libyan Amazigh variety, the first based on new materials to be published in 50 years.¹⁵ But we must also invest in training Libyan students and in maintaining scholarly contact with them after they return to Libyan

13 For two recent pieces outlining language policy in Libya since independence, see Anna Baldinetti, "Languages in Libya: building blocks of national identity and soft power tools," *The Journal of North African Studies* 23/3 (2018), 418–439, and Ines Kohl, "Libya's 'Major Minorities': Berber, Tuareg and Tebu: Multiple Narratives of Citizenship, Language and Border Control," *Middle East Critique* 23/4 (2014), 423–438. For a perspective from neighboring Algeria pleading for the embracing of language diversity as a way of promoting social dialogue, see Mohamed Benrabah, "Language-in-Education Planning in Algeria: Historical Development and Current Issues," *Language Policy* 6 (2007), 225–252.

14 For example, the conference *Libya between History and Revolution: Resilience and New Narrations of Berber Identity* convened at the University of Naples in 2018.

15 Anna Maria Di Tolla & Mohamed Shennib, *Grammatica di berbero nefusi: Fonetica, Morfologia e cenni di sintassi, testi, esercizi, vocabolario* (Milan: Hoepli, 2020).

institutions, since the fact remains that for many topics, Libyan scholars are the ones best placed to do the work. Even though a majority of Libyan scholars who have completed PhDs in linguistics have not continued to publish their research, their unpublished theses are still existing scholarship which can be potentially useful. Some, such as valuable collection of Ghadamsi oral literature, had never even been looked at.¹⁶

In Libya itself, one work on the language of Ghadames and several on Tebu language and culture, both in Arabic and published in Libya, are the first works based on new research to appear on either language in many decades.¹⁷ While these works are hard to access outside of Libya for the time being, those of us in Western institutions must go to the trouble of searching them out, reading, and citing them. More broadly, we must also go to the trouble of connecting and working with language activists, particularly Amazigh and Tebu, who may not have published research in Western academic sense, but whose contributions to their own speech communities is invaluable.



16 Abdurahman M. Yedder, *The Oral Literature Associated with the Traditional Wedding Ceremony at Ghadames* (School of Oriental and African Studies PhD Thesis, 1982).

17 On Ghadames: Abu Bakr Hārūn, *Al-sahl wa al-masīr fī ta'allum al-luġa al-amāzīġiyya bi-lahjat ġadāmis* (Tripoli: Dār al-Firjānī, no date). The recent works on Tebu are cited above.

Challenges and Promises Related to Research on Women and Public Space in Tripoli, Libya

Research on women and public space in Libya is a fascinating and challenging task due to the unstable political environment and lack of accessibility to information related to these sensitive topics, to name a few. As part of my doctoral research, titled *Women's Use of Public Space in Tripoli, Libya between 1850 and 2014*, I conducted a field study in the period between May and November 2013.¹ While digging for the information and collecting the data, I came across a wealth of materials in some archival entities in Tripoli. I also went through an intriguing experience while investigating my case studies and interviewing the study participants.

Research Context

To contextualize my research, it is vital to delineate main themes: the city, public space and women. I examined how these themes were intertwined throughout different historical periods in Libya that spanned between the 1850s and 1990s, a period that covered diverse political regimes and various economic and social conditions. While public space is the central theme linking urban change to women's presence in city spaces, the city of Tripoli can be regarded as the binding agent of the public spaces, where political, economic and social transformations can be traced. In addition to these factors, colonialism and modernization are also leading forces that triggered changes in both

1 Fathia M. Elmenghawi, *Changes in Urban Design and Women's Use of Public Space: The Case of Tripoli, Libya 1835–2014*, PhD dissertation (New Jersey Institute of Technology and Rutgers University, 2016).

design and use of public spaces in Tripoli. With regard to women, they are among the key actors who have contributed to the meanings and the uses of the city's public spaces. The focus of my work has been on their increased visibility in public space and the forces that might have hindered or augmented their presence in these spaces.

The religious, socio-cultural, and socio-economic aspects of Libyan society during the chosen time periods are determining factors for my investigation into the historical background of women's use of public space in Tripoli. So far, no studies have been conducted to examine the way in which women of different religions, nationalities, and classes have used public space at any time in this historic city. I tried to problematize the term "public space" to explore how different actors perceive it. For example, in the period between the late nineteenth century and the mid-twentieth century, the notion of public space was different for an Arab-Muslim Libyan woman than for a Berber Libyan woman, an Arab-Jewish Libyan woman, or a Christian Maltese or Italian woman. In addition, a Turkish or Libyan woman used public spaces differently than a Maltese working class woman or a female Italian farmer did. The heterogeneity of Tripolitanian society, particularly during Ottoman rule and the Italian colonial period, provides a fruitful case to examine how issues of religion, ethnicity, and class were intertwined in the use of public space. Among these interweaving factors it is important to consider the colonizer/colonized relationship, which adds to the complexity of this research. Thus, I include a research question that focuses on how women's use of public outdoor space in Tripoli has changed since 1850 and how these changes have varied by religion, nationality and class. Presently, this range of heterogeneity does not exist and has been replaced by one made up of mostly middle-class Muslim Libyans who come from different parts of the country to reside in Tripoli. Given the increase in women's education and employment, there has also been an increase in women's presence out of the home and into public spaces.

The research also sought to scrutinize women's current use of outdoor public spaces that resulted from transformations of the city center. I conducted observations and interviews in three sites specifically, including Martyr's Square, the Grand Park, and the Corniche. I chose these spaces because they have recently been frequented often by women, who were until recently not very visible in these urban recreational spaces. Because of recent and dramatic transformation of Tripoli Center, particularly in Martyr's Square and the area adjacent to

it during the late 1990s when the Grand Park and the Corniche next to it were opened, the area became an urban hub for recreational and commercial activities. These urban spaces experienced an immense increase in use, which I have examined for the presence of women (when, where and with whom), their behavior and way of dressing, and their activities in these spaces. In my interviews, I also examine women's current needs and preferences for specific spatial elements in outdoor public space.

Research Methodology

The nature of this research necessitated incorporating methods relevant to urban and social history to understand and explain social life, especially of women, in several historical contexts. I focus on the historical period 1835–2014, which is divided into diverse political regimes: the Second Ottoman Period (1835–1911), Italian colonial rule followed by the British Mandate (1911–1952), the Libyan Monarchy (1952–1969), Gaddafi's regime (1969–2011), and the time since the 17th February Revolution of 2011. This periodization illuminates how specific political, economic, and social factors became driving forces for changes in urban design and in women's use of public space in Tripoli's Center during each period.

To investigate the history of Tripoli and the transformation of its center as well as women's past use of public space, I relied on historical and qualitative methods, specifically archival materials such as maps, publications, and court records, as well as interviews with older women aged 65 years and above. Through the historical research, I excavated archival documents to uncover the trends of women's uses of this space and identify factors that have shaped city's past, present, and future. During my fieldwork I consulted some of the main archival institutions in Tripoli, including the Center for Studies and Historical Archives (CSHA), the main governmental archive in the capital city. In particular, I examined internal affairs and court records, both of which were rich sources that provided me with information about women's social and economic status and their daily life struggles in Tripoli since the late nineteenth century. The CSHA also contains two libraries, one for rare publications and journals. I inspected hard copies of old Libyan publications and obtained digital copies of others. Examples of some of the publications I reviewed include newspapers such as *Trablusgarb* (*Tripoli in the West*), الليبي (The Libyan), العمران (Urbanism), اللواء الطرابلسي (The Tripolitanian Banner), and magazines such as ليبيا الحديثة (Modern

Libya), جيل ورسالة (*A Generation and a Message*), مجلّة البيت (*The Home Magazine*), and المرأة (*The Woman*).

100

Another archive that was central to my research was the Library of Antiquities, which is located in the historic edifice, *al-Sarāyā al-Ḥam-rā* (the Red Castle) in Tripoli's center. It also houses old and new books and periodicals that cover a range of topics during the Ottoman and the Italian periods as well as the period after Independence. Among the sources I consulted were the Italian journal *Tripolitania* published in the 1930s, issues of which were selectively translated from the original Italian, and a number of travelogues, such as Todd's *Tripoli the Mysterious* (1912),² and Miss Tully's *Narrative of a Ten Years' Residence at Tripoli in Africa* (1817).³ For maps and engineering drawings, old and new, I accessed The Engineering Office located in *al-Sarāyā al-Ḥam-rā* to look at maps, and the Tripoli Municipal Council government for engineering drawings, including master plans for Tripoli and related documents.

For examining the contemporary use of public space, I employed a qualitative method, including observations of the use of the space and interviews with female users of public space and female architects who contributed to changes in the design of selected outdoor spaces. The qualitative approach in this study also allowed me to inductively change and refine my research questions as the study progressed. In addition to observations and interviews, I also distributed a questionnaire to a number of women in the three outdoor public spaces and in a café in Tripoli's Center. These questions asked respondents to offer information related to their reasons for utilizing public spaces as well as their preferences and attitudes regarding public spaces. The questionnaire also served as an invitation to elaborate further in the form of an interview, which I conducted with some women in the very public spaces they occupied. To supplement this data, I also conducted interviews with a several senior women to gather information about Libyan women's past use of public space.

2 Mabel L. Todd, *Tripoli the Mysterious* (London: Grant Richards, 1912).

3 Miss Tully, *Narrative of a ten years' residence at Tripoli in Africa* (London: Henry Colburn, 1817).

Research Challenges

It is important to highlight some difficulties related to the archival search in Libya. Firstly, ongoing renovations of the CSHA building interrupted data collection and the Center allowed researchers to obtain only nine copies of the court records on a CD and even taking digital photos is not permitted. Digitization was also one of the major concerns raised by one of the architects who works in the Engineering Office of *al-Sarāyā al-Ḥamrā*. Although some of maps have been digitized, many other significant Italian maps are still in a bad condition. The deteriorated quality of these engineering drawings made it difficult to scrutinize them because key missing parts contain important information.

Secondly, numerous challenges ensued during site observations. The observation strategy employed in this research was driven by a desire to get a little closer to what women actually do in public space. I observed the presence of women in these spaces (when, where and with whom), their behavior and way of dressing, and their activities. I organized systematic site visits during the weekdays and the weekends at different times of the day. It was important to strategically think about how to carry out the observation in these huge outdoor spaces; Martyrs' Square was tripled in size during Gaddafi regime, from 2.7 acres to nearly 8 acres, the Grand Park is about 20 acres, and the Corniche is about 25 acres. In order to systematically observe these large areas, every site was divided into zones: Martyrs' Square into three zones, the Grand Park into six zones, and the Corniche into four zones. The zones were delineated in these ways based on the layout of the space and the functions associated with each zone. I followed certain patterns of movement through each space and when transiting from one site to another and making observations.

Rigorously documenting my observations also proved challenging owing to social and cultural norms around photographing people, especially women, in public. To engage in systematic data collection while respecting these norms, I recorded women's activities and locations as well as characteristics that are readily observable, such as approximate age and type of dress, on prepared tables. Additionally, I used behavioral maps, a systematic observation technique that tracks behavior over space and time. I created a series of symbols to indicate particular elements of my observations and placed them on each site's map. When one of the sites was very crowded or when I anticipated women might feel uncomfortable seeing someone observing them

and writing notes, I would audio-record my notes with my phone. To supplement my written observations, I photographed public spaces deliberately from a distance to make sure that women's features did not clearly appear in the photos. Given the sensitivity of photographing people, and women in particular in Libyan society, I often took pictures of a relative or friend who accompanied me in some of my site visits or I would ask them to take a photo for me at a site where I wanted to document an interesting observation.

As a non-participant observer, I encountered some additional challenges to occupying public spaces as a woman. I was subjected to catcalling numerous times; on one occasion, a man who was of relatively old age was so persistent in his harassment that I stopped my observations and I went home. In another incident, I was almost questioned by a man who appeared to be on a date and felt that I was taking note of him and his girlfriend. These experiences underscore how observations of public space, regardless of site, carry with them significant challenges, some of which are particular to women as researchers. This seems common to female researchers, particularly those who pursue ethnographic research. According to Hanson and Richards, stories from female graduate researchers depict such experiences of harassment and catcalling, in addition to feeling unsafe, while conducting their field studies.⁴

Despite all these challenges, there is always a promise in the future of research on topics related to women and public space in Libya. I discovered it in the willingness of the people with whom I encountered during my field study, who were eager to assist in many ways. The staff in the archives, the librarians, the architects as well as the interviewees, were collectively supportive in terms of providing data and information related to my research. The time I spent while interviewing the senior women was especially enjoyable and productive. The narratives about their past experiences in the domestic space and navigating public space were important to trace how, when and why women began to venture out in the city spaces. When it comes to the women I interviewed in the selected outdoor public spaces, many of them were as happy and surprised that someone was paying attention to their needs in such spaces. They were very open in their responses

4 Rebecca Hanson & Patricia Richards, *Harassed: Gender, Bodies, and Ethnographic Research* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2019).

to the survey and to my interview questions. As a result, I was able to articulate my study findings and draw significant conclusions which I hope will impact how we think about public space in Libya.



Field Research in Libya

Conducting field research in Libya presents itself with a set of challenges for both those who have access and those who seek to find connections. Not only has the country been in civil war over the past decade but also research sources such as archives are often inaccessible. The political polarization and the policies of silencing voices have taken such deep roots that conducting interviews and focus groups face numerous setbacks. They vary from the rejection of participants for fear of being associated with “journalism” and therefore being at risk of interrogation to forced disappearances to direct violent interruptions. The cause for this distrust depends on where you are conducting research in the country and where it might be perceived as threatening to the present status quo.

This essay draws on my experience attempting to conduct ethnographic research in Libya in 2020 before COVID lockdowns set in. I address the consequences of the national and international pandemic measures on in-person meetings and how I had to change my research methodology to adapt to the numerous constraints. It will also cover the ethical question of conducting interviews and focus groups in social/political science with participants who might be at risk regardless of their position and how to best avoid such consequences.

Introduction

Libyan and foreign researchers face a multitude of challenges when conducting field research in Libya, from restrictions of access to potential participants to struggling institutions and archives that are underfunded, understaffed, and often closed due to the developments of the conflict. Those who are interested in conducting field work especially in the political and social sciences must conduct a risk assessment for themselves and participants in the study.

To conduct interviews and focus groups for political and social

science projects, a longer time period must be allocated to finding interviewees. Researchers must foresee delays and remain flexible to possibly completely changing their methodologies depending on the situation in the country. This should be informed and updated by contacts in Libya and certain measures should be taken for the safety of the participants and data.

These complicated conditions for field research pose a number of ethical and methodological questions which this essay will touch upon briefly.

Context of Field Research in Libya

Libyan and foreign researchers have always had difficulties accessing research in Libya, from restrictions on visas, to restrictions of topics, to lack of funding afforded by universities. Libraries and archives are understaffed, with certain resources completely off limits due to their political nature.¹ In the wake of the uprisings that swept across the Middle East and North Africa in 2011, demands for protests in Libya were increasing. These protests erupted all over the country, eventually leading to an intervention and an eight-month confrontation between the opposition and governmental forces.²

The changes brought by the revolt opened up Libya to journalists and researchers who were interested in documenting the developments of the transition. In the climate of liberation after 2011, access was given to large parts of the country with little restrictions. Conducting research was accessible if challenging given that the country was still going through armed conflicts.³ This open space lasted until late 2013 when political developments resulted in post electoral violence in 2014 and Libya entered another stage of civil war.⁴

1 See Landen Garland, *2011 Libyan Civil War* (White Word Publications, 2012); Osama A. Tashani "The Scientific Research in Libya: The Role of the New Generation of Researchers," *Libyan Journal of Medicine* 4/4 (2009), 129.

2 *Ibid.*

3 See for example Lindsey Hilsum, *Sandstorm: Libya from Gaddafi to Revolution* (New York: Penguin, 2012).

4 See reporting from the International Crisis Group, "Libya: Getting Geneva

Human rights defenders, activists and journalists were targeted, assassinated, and forcibly disappeared and random shelling and bombing of infrastructure often targeted schools and universities which led to long term closures of campuses.⁵ Over the years, the space for conducting activities especially in relation to research and journalism has shrunk considerably. For research in political and social science, the conflict in Libya has created a highly polarized environment, which not only means that access can be difficult but that often individuals refuse to participate for fear of reprisals.

In March 2020, Libya confirmed its first case of coronavirus and began to take containment measures, which included a total shut down of institutions and a curfew on movement that was restricted to a few hours during the day.⁶ I had travelled to Libya earlier that month to conduct my ethnographic field research and it is safe to say that my plans had to completely change and I was unable to follow through with field work. It was not only a question of the logistics of a total shut down, but the military offensive against Tripoli was still happening and there was a general sense among the Libyan public of being overwhelmed and burned out.

While the shutdown measures have changed over the past year and a half and, to some extent, are now more relaxed, the situation remains incredibly unpredictable. Researchers will have to be confined to conducting interviews over the phone and online which poses several ethical and methodological questions as it concerns future research projects in the country.

Right,” in *Middle East and North Africa Report* No. 157 (February 2015), <https://www.crisisgroup.org/middle-east-north-africa/north-africa/libya/libya-getting-geneva-right>

- 5 For reports about constraints on educational institutions in Libya, see the report “Libya: Education Under Attack 2018” published by the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack, <https://eua2018.protectingeducation.org/libya>
- 6 The first case of COVID-19 was confirmed in Libya on Tuesday, March 24, 2020, “Libya Confirms 1st Coronavirus Case” in *Asharq Al-Awsat*, March 25, 2020, <https://english.aawsat.com//home/article/2198246/libya-confirms-1st-coronavirus-case>

Conducting Interviews and Focus Groups

In my experience, conducting interviews is extremely time consuming when attempting to reach the wider population. In contexts of distrust, the snowballing technique, a qualitative interviewing methodology that involves relying on other's recommendations for additional interviewees, helps resolve trust issues.⁷ I have found that participants in studies prefer to conduct interviews over the phone, even if the researcher is in the same location; this has especially been the case among women, for whom mobility can be restricted.

There are also security concerns that arise if the researcher were to meet interviewees in a coffee shop or another public space. There needs to be consideration given to potential perceptions of the public of how interviews by researchers might appear to be journalistic interviews. This assumption can lead to interviews being disrupted and poses considerable risk for the interviewee and researcher.

Focus groups are even more challenging, especially if the group has mixed gender participants; mixed gender meetings can be perceived negatively by certain conservative factions. Researchers have to take measures to mitigate disruptions of focus groups, such as selecting a neighbourhood that is relatively calm and has no armed groups. An even better option would be to see if the researcher can collaborate with the municipality or schools, if possible, to conduct these focus groups.

There are now more possibilities to conduct interviews and focus groups online but this approach can limit the research in terms of having a diverse sample of participants, which leads to a number of methodological considerations when designing political and social science research projects in Libya. My initial plans of conducting ethnographic observations and in-depth interviews with random participants have changed to grounded theory with a much smaller and more focused sample of interviewees.

Would it be easier and more feasible to conduct quantitative re-

7 For a brief description of the snowballing technique in qualitative research see "Snowballing Technique," in *A Dictionary of Sociology*, ed. John Scott and Gordon Marshall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100514607>

search than qualitative? This might be the case; however, it would still limit the research sample since it relies on people being online and having access to phones and computers. Researchers must consider structural issues that impact access to participants in Libya.

109

Ethical Questions

There are a number of ethical questions that must be carefully considered when working with Libyan participants, especially when researching conflict-sensitive topics that would pose a risk to the individual's livelihood. These considerations are not to discourage researchers from conducting the work but to establish certain guidelines such as using secure communication applications and encrypting emails and datasets.

I have observed research projects led by researchers abroad that rely heavily on young Libyan researchers to conduct field work without proper compensation or training. This is incredibly dangerous not only for the safety of the young researchers but also the validity of the data and, therefore, research findings. Research budgets must take into consideration proper compensation for and capacity building of young researchers.

The recent developments in the country might open up more possibilities of research and collaborations. Libyan universities struggled for the past decade and so there is a need for technical support for these institutions.⁸ Future programs must consider existing systematic discrimination and violence against certain social groups and women but also the lack of proper infrastructure to integrate young people into scientific research.



8 Eliza Volkmann, "Libya's universities face renaissance if new peace can hold," *University World News: Africa Edition*, May 20, 2021, <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20210516164027391>

Knowing Libya: Ethnography

Ethnography remains among the most underused methods in Libyan studies. A dearth of Libyan ethnography pairs troublingly with paradoxical tropes that originate in the colonial period: that Libya is on the one hand exceptional, distinct from the cities and countries that surround it in remoteness and isolation, and on the other hand quickly knowable, enabling the outsiders that do gain access to rapidly attain expertise. A similar representational pairing operated in cultural production that accompanied the Italian colonialization of Libya, one that Brian McLaren points to in a description of a 1906 play, *Più che l'amore*, of "Africa as both *terra incognita* – an atavistic terrain where [the heroes of colonial literature] could exist outside of the restrictive morals of contemporary society – and *terra promessa*, a land already latent with the call for Italian colonial expansion."¹ If in the early twentieth century these tropes packaged indigenous lives for colonizer-tourist consumption, in the early twenty-first century their analogues encourage short-term, policy-oriented research engagement and narrative overgeneralization. Against these currents, what are needed are long-term studies, critical ethnographic methods, and interdisciplinary approaches that contextualize, rather than exceptionalize, Libyan lives and worlds.

The notion that Libya was distinct from its neighbors became a facet of Italian colonial production of knowledge about Libya in part due to of a politics of cultural reclamation. Colonial policy makers, and the researchers who supported them, sought evidence of continuity in what they understood as Roman civilization only partially disrupted by Arab, Ottoman, and "Sudanese" (Black African) others. For some

1 Brian L. McLaren, *Architecture and Tourism in Italian Colonial Libya: An Ambivalent Modernism* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2006), 110-111.

writers, this meant valorizing a version of indigeneity that they framed as enduring from “Latin origins”;² for others, it meant a dismissal of “Berber culture,” whose “inability to progress” had been palliated historically only by outside – Roman/ Italian – civilizing forces.³ This was a particular type of civilizing mission in that it produced a taxonomy of cultural, racial, and civilizational artifacts in order to label some as “Latin” and others as Other.

These colonially-produced artifacts were presented not as the rarified purview of scientists, but, importantly, as part of the display of indigenous culture for tourists to the colony, who were encouraged to think of themselves as researchers. The Italian Touring Club’s guidebook, for example, described the people of Ghadames as having “maintained their original characteristics intact, so that even today they constitute an interesting topic of study.”⁴ Across various Libyan sites, “the research expedition became a model for structuring the tourist expedition,” with groups of tourists following itineraries previously used by teams of researchers, expecting to encounter unchanging cultural performances.⁵ At the same time, visual iconography made the “eye of the tourist” into “the eye of the anthropologist” with postcards and flyers that blended the ostensibly scientific with tourism advertising.⁶ Aesthetically and even methodologically, “the tourist experience of indigenous culture [...] was seen as being coincident with the objective practices of scientific study.”⁷

The notion that any traveler could rapidly gain expertise in the people and places of Italian colonized Africa has had lasting import for Libyan studies. Twentieth-century ethnographic writing in and on Libya was shaped not only by the vantage points of Italian and British colonial-military officials, and tourists, but also subsequently by the epistemological frameworks of oil company executives and western diplomats. As in the Italian-colonized Horn of Africa, the writings of

2 McLaren, *Architecture and Tourism*, 166.

3 *Ibid*, 118.

4 Cited in McLaren, *Architecture and Tourism*, 107.

5 McLaren, *Architecture and Tourism*, 119-120.

6 *Ibid*, 122.

7 *Ibid*, 106-107.

“accidental ethnographers” were more numerous in the colonial period than those of anthropologists.⁸ What is remarkable is that this has remained the case in the decades since. In comparison with other parts of North Africa, formal anthropological studies of Libya remain very limited; books and even article-length ethnographies of any Libyan settings are exceedingly few. Further, those few are themselves not widely available.⁹ There do exist anthropologists who have spent years in Libya.¹⁰ Still, much more prolific are the writings of the former diplomats and corporate executives whose sojourns in Libya lent themselves to later opportunities to publish.

On the whole we simply lack the varied and textured ethnographic writing that one finds focused in a place such as Morocco, and even to a lesser extent Algeria and Tunisia. Indeed, we know that Libya is too often simply omitted from research across a variety of fields in surveys and anthologies focused on North Africa. With its distinct colonial history and continued reputation for being “inaccessible” for foreign researchers, Libyan social space is held apart, resulting in a kind of no-man’s-land characterization that simply doesn’t match the realities of the country’s continuing interconnectedness with its neighbors on all sides.

Perhaps as a result of the pressure of the field’s sparseness, the authors of the ethnographies that do exist have sometimes taken on overly ambitious descriptive scope. Yet even those texts that overreach have offered nuance when compared with the bulk of books on Libyan politics and the many texts that perform a representational elision of Libyan society as the singular figure of Muammar al-Gaddafi. We are only beginning to free ourselves from the burden of this representa-

8 Barbara Sorgoni, “Italian Anthropology and the Africans: The Early Colonial Period,” in *A Place in the Sun: Africa in Italian Colonial Culture from Post-Unification to the Present*, ed. Patrizia Palumbo (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 62-80.

9 British anthropologist John Davis’ 1987 book, *Libyan Politics: Tribe and Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press), is out of print, as is Marius K. and Mary Jane Deeb’s 1982 *Libya Since the Revolution: Aspects of Social and Political Development* (New York: Praeger Publishers), which draws on interviews as well as locally published sources.

10 Thomas Hüsken’s 2019 monograph, *Tribal Politics in the Borderland of Egypt and Libya* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan), is a welcome exception.

tional elision after Gaddafi's death more than a decade ago. The eclipsing of the nation writ large with its individual former dictator is by no means something exclusive to the Libyan context. We have seen, in a number of other settings, that powerful political figures with narcissistic tendencies and cult followings garner attention at the expense of the masses – all while speaking in the name of those masses. The legacies of these representational elisions are many. One aspect is particularly important for Libyan studies to reckon with: the over-focus on Muammar for all those years has left us, I think, less capable and with a greater amount of work to be done in order to understand how his 42-year reign shaped Libyan lifeworlds and politics. Ethnographic studies of the present and oral histories of the past will be essential tools in this work.

Alongside the eclipsing of the many by the individual figure of Gaddafi, a further representational challenge for the development of critical ethnography in Libyan studies persists in the fact that especially post-2011, journalistic accounts of Libya have come to dominate. During the 2011 uprising, the country saw an influx of foreign journalists, most of whom were navigating Libya for the first time. One of the enduring consequences of this influx was the creation a wave of temporary jobs for educated, bi- and trilingual young Libyans who initially became fixers and translators, and some eventually news reporters and producers. What had been a narrow field of state media rapidly shifted into a range of news outlets across the region with a variety of funding sources and attendant politics. This change profoundly shaped the post-2011 lives of the upper middle class of the generation who came of age with the revolution, now in their late twenties and early thirties. These young people moved to Tunisia, Jordan, Turkey, and elsewhere for jobs in very partisan media. Those left in-country find work if they are lucky in the economy of humanitarian aid, working with the Red Crescent, UNICEF, UNHCR, and the IOM.

Why remark on the career prospects of Libya's millennials here? We know that our research, across disciplines but especially ethnography, takes place in dialogic production with our interlocutors in the field. It is of deep consequence, I believe, that this generation has had to assimilate to the global and regional norms of news reporting to narrate events in their home country. In the years since 2011, news reports have come to nearly monopolize the globally circulating representational field in portraying Libyan daily life, from Guardian updates on U.N.-led peace processes to edgy Vice reports on what I will

inelegantly call the coast guard-militia-clandestine migration-human trafficking complex. In this context, one characterized by a hegemony of the rhetorics of news reporting, ethnography, if it hopes for legibility, comes to be weighted with positivist expectations and colonial logics for determining relevance. We see these logics, for example, in reporting on Mediterranean crossings, which tend to implicitly center European actors, concerns, and politics.

However, I want to stress that, important as it unquestionably is in its own right, journalism is not ethnography. Didier Fassin puts it pithily in a 2016 interview when he says of these two fields, “they’re different jobs, different practices, and different ethos.”¹¹ Ethnographic work offers a very different set of tools and insights than news reporting. It is, first and foremost, rooted in duration: whereas interviews done over the course of a day or a week often suffice to report a news story, one cannot do credible ethnographic writing without sustained engagement. Even long form journalistic pieces that are the result of months of years of investigation do not constitute ethnographic research. This is in part because ethnography is, among other things, an exploration of shared experience. Ethnography has a different relation to advocacy than journalism – certainly in part because of the distinctive, if overlapping, audiences these modes approach. Crucially, ethnography has different relationships to positivism and positionality than journalism. Ethnographic work explores lifeworlds through the voices and stories that animate them, in turn translating experience into narrative. Ethnography should enable the unfolding of layers and tracing of constellations that produce a process, practice, or situation.

As Hager El Hadidi writes, “Unlike a report or information, a story does not aim to convey the pure essence of the thing.”¹² In this way, ethnography shares much with the writing of fiction, and ethnographers have long explored the overlaps and boundaries between these fields. Here, also, is an underutilized area for Libyan studies. While we have not as of yet seen a flourishing anthropological practice in Libyan

11 Didier Fassin, “Ethnography and Theory,” *Conversations with History*, University of California Television, 13 April 2016, <https://tannerlectures.berkeley.edu/2015-2016-lecture-fassin/>.

12 Hager El Hadidi, *Zar: Spirit Possession, Music, and Healing Rituals in Egypt* (Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 2016), 29.

universities, one does find a depth of both creative writing and literary critique, as well as scholars from other fields for whom the writing of fiction has offered an outlet for sociocultural commentary.¹³ The ethnographers of the Libyan present and future that I hope to see will do well to gather, and write in conversation with, this material.

The prospects are vast for a new generation of critical ethnographers to denaturalize the Libya-as-Gaddafi slippage, and to portray and theorize multifaceted sociopolitical landscapes in the country through grounded research. Likewise, we can depart from journalistic rhetorics and their “pariah state” predecessors to theorize the Libyan quotidian and its imbrication in broader structures of power. It is that question of imbrication that feels to me like both a stumbling block and a powerful key. It will take the concerted effort of a team of scholars, I think, to write Libyan places, people, and politics back into relation with neighbors; state, corporate, and individual spoilers; and global movements of people, capital, media, and affect.



13 A notable example is Libyan attorney Azza Kamel Maghur’s *Fashloun: Stories of [the] February [Revolution]* (*Fashlūm: Qiṣaṣ fībrāyir*) (Benghazi: al-Rowad Books, 2012).

Libyan Studies: A Call to Sociology

For decades Libya has been described by scholars and observers as a “stateless” society that lacks key institutions that define modern states, rendering the country a “pariah” and an exception. If, however, we take up the definition of the state offered by sociologist Max Weber as a “human community that (successfully) claims the *monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force* within a given territory,”¹ Libya can certainly not be denied its statehood. Indeed, it is the monopoly on violence within the state in Libya that has defined its paradigmatic features and fissures over the course of the last several decades. If we understand this violence as a key defining feature of *all* states, we can appreciate that Libya is not so much an aberration or exception as it is a compelling case to inform understandings of states and societies around the world.

I open the discussion of the future of Libyan studies with the acknowledgement that it is regarded as an exception because any inquiry in the field of Libyan studies must first attend to the question, “What is Libya”? On a regional level, Libya has largely been written out of Middle Eastern Studies, which tends to define the Middle East in terms of Egypt and countries to its east. States in North Africa—Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco—remain identified across literatures as “the Maghreb” owing to their common history of French colonial rule. It is in this way that, epistemologically, Libya has been largely omitted from both the fields of “Middle Eastern Studies” and “North African Studies.” The absence of Libya in these spaces compels us to acknowledge that epistemological categories are themselves colonial legacies that impose artificial boundaries around geography itself. These legacies are legible in an example offered by Egyptian writer and doctor

1 Max Weber, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, edited by H. Gerth & C.W. Mills (Abingdon: Routledge, 1948 [1919]), 78.

Nawal El Saadawi who writes that she was once asked “What country are you from?” to which she responded “Egypt.” Her interlocutor questioned, “Do you consider Egypt to be in Africa?” At that moment, El Saadawi reports, she found herself questioning the empirical realities of geography and, by extension, her very identity: “So I found Egypt being uprooted from Africa too...Now I no longer know the continent in which Egypt can be found, nor do I know if I am Arab, or African, or whether I should be here at all.”²

This is the first critical point of intervention required of Libyan Studies – we must make Libya legible as a contemporary state shaped by complex and overlapping contexts and interactions that span multiple regions and geographies. Studies of Libya should be central to discussions unfolding in the fields of Middle Eastern studies, Maghreb studies, African studies, Mediterranean studies, and American studies, among others. By studying Libya from multiple disciplinary lenses, we invite modes of inquiry and comparative frameworks that simultaneously acknowledge its uniqueness and the histories, cultures, and political systems it shares with other societies and states. To take it a step further, when we open up the space to earnestly consider Libya as a case that is not exceptional but, rather, central to understanding dimensions of social and political life within and beyond its borders, we might be able to acknowledge its importance to numerous other fields.

Indeed, there is a profound intellectual debt owed to societies in North Africa in the development of social theory. There is little acknowledgement in the social sciences that so many of the key theorists whose work continues to impact disciplines such as anthropology and sociology undertook their studies in North African societies. Pierre Bourdieu studied the Kabyle in Algeria to develop theories of *capital*, *habitus*, and *symbolic violence*, concepts that have transformed cultural anthropology and approaches to ethnography in sociology.³

2 Nawal El Saadawi, *The Nawal El Saadawi Reader* (New York: Zed Books, 1997), 118.

3 It is acknowledged that Bourdieu especially drew from his studies of North Africa in his *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1972). See, for instance, Craig Calhoun, “Pierre Bourdieu and social transformation: lessons from Algeria,” *Development and Change* 37/6 (2006), 1403–1415. Also see Julian Go, “Decolonizing Bourdieu: Colonial and Postcolonial Theory in

Michel Foucault lived and worked in Tunisia shortly after its independence from French colonial rule and become politically active in contesting neocolonialism in the emerging state.⁴ It was partly from these observations that he developed his theories of *disciplinary power*, *governmentality*, and *biopolitics*.⁵ Such frameworks have become indispensable to critical studies in sociology of state, power, and politics.

The work of making Libya epistemologically legible will lay the necessary foundation for a second critical intervention in Libyan studies, namely shifting foci from macro-level to micro-level analyses. Any inquiry into scholarship produced about Libya offers a relatively narrow set of possibilities, generally a mix of sand and Gaddafi as in Lindsey Hilsum's *Sandstorm: Libya from Gaddafi to Revolution*.⁶ Some texts implicitly define Libya by Gaddafi as is the case with John Oakes' *Libya: The History of Gaddafi's Pariah State*⁷ or Alison Pargeter's *Libya: The Rise and Fall of Qaddafi*.⁸ Others may simply foreground Gaddafi in the title or book cover, such as Annick Cojean's *Gaddafi's Harem: The Story of a Young Woman and the Abuses of Power in Libya*⁹ or Ulf

Pierre Bourdieu's Early Work," *Sociological Theory* 31/1 (2013), 49–74.

- 4 The recent allegations of Foucault's sexual abuse and exploitation of Tunisian youth also reiterates a necessary reckoning for the academy concerning the relationship of academics to the communities and societies in which they immerse themselves. For more information about the allegations against Foucault, see the interview with Guy Sorman in London's *The Times* entitled "French Philosopher Michel Foucault 'abused boys in Tunisia,'" March 28, 2021, <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/french-philosopher-michel-foucault-abused-boys-in-tunisia-6t5sj7jvw>.
- 5 See Kathryn Medien, "Foucault in Tunisia: The encounter with intolerable power," *The Sociological Review* 68/3 (2020), 492–507.
- 6 Lindsey Hilsum, *Sandstorm: Libya from Gaddafi to Revolution* (New York: Penguin Books, 2012).
- 7 John Oakes, *Libya: The History of Gaddafi's Pariah State* (Gloucestershire: The History Press, 2011).
- 8 Alison Pargeter, *Libya: The Rise and Fall of Qaddafi* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012).
- 9 By focusing on a Libyan woman's experience of sexual violence by Gaddafi, Cojean's work offers an example of a micro-level analysis that could enrich our understandings of the relationship between politics and everyday

Laessing's *Understanding Libya Since Gaddafi*.¹⁰ While a four-decades long regime necessitates a sustained focus on its leadership, this focus enjoys a disproportionate share of the corpus of scholarship that we could envision in Libyan studies. In addition, the focus on Gaddafi—in domestic Libyan politics or international relations—typically offers a macro-level analysis that privileges as interlocutors agents of the state, loyal or defected. The insights we acquire from macro-level analyses are critical to our understandings of any state and society but they must also be complemented with micro-level analyses that afford us what Clifford Geertz famously described as “thick description.”¹¹ The observations of everyday life are not divorced from politics; on the contrary, politics permeates daily life in the institutions and policies to which individuals react, conform, and rebel.¹²

A shift toward micro-level analyses in Libyan studies opens a vast horizon of potential subject matter, much of which stands to challenge long-standing assumptions and premises of sociological inquiry. Libyan studies should take up the sociological emphasis on social groups—gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, social class, and age—as well as institutions ranging from the family, state, military, economics, religion, and healthcare while also extending frameworks in these areas in new directions. For instance, the study of social classes in sociology represents a long legacy of studying capitalism in European societies, in which social class is a key social group that animates political life. This has become institutionalized in areas of study within sociology, particularly as capitalism has expanded globally beyond anyone's ability to escape it. However, other logics of social group solidarity and contention persist and ought to be understood and ex-

life in Libya. See Annick Cojean, *Gaddafi's Harem: The Story of a Young Woman and the Abuses of Power in Libya* (New York: Grove Press, 2013).

10 Ulf Laessing, *Understanding Libya Since Gaddafi* (London: Hurst and Company, 2020).

11 Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 27

12 Veena Das reiterates the significance of everyday life to politics, specifically in the case of how state violence manifests itself in everyday social life. See Veena Das, *Life and Words: Violence and the Descent into the Ordinary* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007).

amined more thoroughly. In North Africa, kin groups have historically been of central import to social and political relations, coming to more prominence in some countries than others during the colonial era in particular.¹³ The politics of kin groups were also central to Gaddafi's grievances with the post-colonial monarchy in Libya and kin groups were the basis from which key social movements emerged to contest state violence under his regime.¹⁴ Kin groups as political forces do not currently occupy a prominent role in sociological analyses of social or political life and Libyan studies could become an intellectual space where such issues are explored.

Similarly, the opportunity to shift toward micro-level and comparative analyses affords us the possibility of producing new insights about a range of subjects and political epochs. Taking the colonial period as an example, Algeria is widely considered to have experienced one of the most deadly and violent colonial contexts. The estimated death toll varies significantly by source with Algerians claiming that upwards of 1.5 million Algerians—nearly one half of the population at the time—were killed by French colonial authorities over a 132-year period.¹⁵ Libya was distinct from its North African counterparts in that it was colonized by Italy and lost fewer people to colonial violence. However, if we put colonial violence in context, the deaths orchestrated by

13 Studies like that of Mounira Charrad, who has studied the role of what she terms “kin-based solidarities” in the development of women’s rights in Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia, point to the significance of kin groups as political actors. This moves us beyond simple claims about “tribes” into a more critical analysis of how social forms do or do not have ongoing relevance in particular regions of the world. See Mounira M. Charrad, *States and Women’s Rights: The Making of Postcolonial Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

14 Families who experienced the disappearance of relatives suspected of organizing against the regime developed an organization to contest the suspected state-sanctioned killing of prisoners in Abu Salim Prison in 1996. The group they formed, the Association of Families of the Martyrs of the Abu Salim Prison Massacre, publicly protested the regime in Benghazi years prior to the 2011 uprising.

15 Benjamin Brower, *A Desert Named Peace: The Violence of France’s Empire in the Algerian Sahara, 1844-1902* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), 4.

Italian colonial authorities of approximately 83,000 Libyans amounts to over a third of the population in the short time frame of just over three decades. The scope of colonial violence in Libya has until recently been especially underexamined compared to the French colonized states of Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco.¹⁶ Comparative frameworks and an approach to Libya that does not regard it as an exception or aberration offers us the opportunity to enrich our understandings of how critical historical moments, such as the era of colonialism, unfolded across different regions.

Lastly, a shift toward the micro-level invites a complementary transition in methodological approaches to Libyan studies. A common refrain to justify the exclusion of Libya from systematic study is that Libya has been physically inaccessible and, therefore, unsuitable for sustained study. Of the many lessons to be appreciated from the COVID-19 pandemic is the observation that we have the ability to be connected across geographies and time zones and our ability to physically travel can be interrupted at any time. This is not unique to Libya. This pandemic period might inspire us to reconsider how our standard methodologies could be expanded in new directions. For instance, there is a rich and vibrant digital culture among Libyans that can facilitate connections and serve as an avenue to cultivate meaningful relationships despite periods of physical distance and interruption. Libyans—in the country and in the diaspora¹⁷—are present on numerous platforms including Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Viber,

16 Ali Abdullatif Ahmida has rigorously detailed what he argues was a sustained genocide and internment of Libyans by Italian colonists in the twenty-year period following Italy's invasion of Tripoli in 1911. He draws on oral narratives among survivors to detail and reconstruct the scope of violence in Libya during the early twentieth century, offering a critical example of how micro-level analysis can offer macro-level insights about social life and politics. See Ali Abdullatif Ahmida, *Genocide in Libya: Shar, a Hidden Colonial History* (New York: Routledge, 2021), 3.

17 Libyan diasporas are a critical population to include in our development of Libyan studies as they can profoundly inform our understandings of nationalism and identity, among other research areas. Dana Moss's study of Libyan and Syrian diaspora activism during the Arab uprisings in 2011 offers an example of the potentials of this kind of work. See Dana Moss, "Transnational Repression, Diaspora Mobilization, and the Case of the Arab Spring," *Social Problems* 63/4 (2016), 480–498.

and Whatsapp, among many others. They could hardly be considered inaccessible or remote. We must challenge our disciplinary expectations to usher in methodologies that can privilege not only exclusively in-person interactions but also digital interactions. While there can be no substitute for immersing oneself in the interactional spaces and places of Libya, extending our methodologies to the digital realm also facilitates another important intervention in Libyan studies, which is to engage in more longitudinal research. Most studies about Libya concern discrete time frames or take the form of in-depth interviews at one point in time; a beneficial direction is to study social and political life over protracted periods. Longitudinal work helps us answer the pivotal “why” questions as we can observe change over time, a critical aspect of both qualitative and quantitative work, such as demography. In the case of research on violence and trauma, it is essential to engage in this work over extended periods to develop the rapport and demonstrate a sustained commitment to communities. These methodological approaches also challenge the broader rhythms of the academy, which has in recent decades accelerated publishing expectations in what are arguably unsustainable and intellectually deficient “publish or perish” paradigms at odds with the work required in many areas, including Libyan studies.

Collectively, these three critical interventions in Libyan studies—making Libya intellectually legible, undertaking micro-level analyses from sociological perspectives, and expanding methodological approaches—will not only serve in our knowledge and understanding of Libya but stand to challenge the broader Eurocentrism of contemporary academia more generally. All of the interventions outlined here, while specific to the Libyan context, inform also the marginalization of other geographies and societies within the academy. These inequalities are now inscribed not only in our canons but, increasingly, within the very algorithms—a contemporary manifestation of colonial frameworks—that digitally direct our attention to some contexts and not others. Thus, the interventions proposed here, in tandem with the insights of my colleagues, lean in to these challenges and invite Libyan specialists and non-specialists to do the same.



ὉΘΗΣΣ Λ ὉἸῶΝ ὀῖῖῖῖῖῖ ὈΨῶ Ὀῖῖῖῖῖ Ἰ ῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖ ῖ 2019/2969
 Ἀ ῖῖῖῖ Ἀ Ἰῖῖῖ Ἰ ῖῖῖῖῖῖ Ἰ ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ Ἀ ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ Ὀῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖ ῖ
 ῖῖῖῖῖ ῖ ῖῖῖῖῖῖ ὀῖῖῖῖῖ. ὀῖῖῖῖῖ ὀῖ ῖῖῖῖῖ Ἰ ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ, ῖῖῖῖῖ
 ῖῖῖῖῖῖ Ἰ ῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖ 102 km Ὀῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖ Ἰ ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ, Ἀ ῖῖῖῖῖ Ἰ ῖῖῖῖῖ
 ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ, ὀῖῖῖῖῖ ὀ ῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖ Ἀ ῖῖῖῖῖ
 ῖῖῖῖῖ Ὀ ῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖῖ Ἀ ῖῖῖῖῖ Ἀῖῖ Ὀῖῖ ῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖῖ, ῖῖῖῖῖ Ἀ
 ῖῖῖῖῖ Ἰ ῖῖῖῖῖ Ἰῖῖῖ. ὀῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖ Ἀ ῖῖῖῖῖ Ὀῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖ ῖ ῖῖῖῖῖ Ὀῖῖ
 ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖ Ὀῖῖῖ Ὀῖῖ Ἰῖῖῖῖ ῖῖ Ὀ ῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖ ὀῖῖῖῖῖ Ἀ ῖῖῖῖῖῖ
 Ἰ ῖῖῖῖ ῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖῖ Ἰ ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ, ὀῖῖῖῖῖ Ὀῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖ Ἰ ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ
 ῖῖῖῖῖ Ἀ ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ, Ἀ ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ Ἀ ὀῖῖῖῖῖ Ἰ ῖῖῖῖῖῖ ὀῖῖῖῖῖ
 ῖῖῖῖῖ ὀῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ, ῖῖῖῖ Ἰῖῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ
 ῖ Ὀῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖῖ Ἀ ῖῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖῖῖῖ ὀῖῖῖῖῖ ῖῖ ὀῖῖῖῖῖῖῖ ῖ
 ῖῖῖῖῖ.





The Shore is the Land is a project by Blqees Zuhair that began in 2019 and seeks to consider migration histories and seafaring from the perspective situated within the Libyan coast. Building on the context of Zuwara, a seaside city situated 102 km west of Tripoli, and home to an Amazigh community, the project considers how indigeneity and movement are co-constitutive and made visible through social ritual, architectural formations, and local imaginaries. The city today is one of the main departure points for migration to Europe from Libya and by thinking through space-making, spatial memory, and social activism, the aim is to expose the multiple ways in which mobility is imagined and practiced, and becoming an example of a mechanism to be able to consider how maritime space is modulated by movement, and what are the ways in which curatorial and documentary practices can engage and contribute to such context.

Responses to:
Ali Ahmida, *Genocide in Libya: Share, A Hidden
Colonial History* (Routledge, 2020)

Uncovering Concealed Pasts, Centering Silenced Knowledges

Genocide in Libya: Shar, A Hidden Colonial History by Ali Abdullatif Ahmida offers a rare and preliminary glimpse into the Libyan genocide. In committing to a great undertaking that transcends disciplines, dominant methods, and borders, Ahmida's book attempts to single-handedly make up for scholarly neglect around the brutal Italian Fascist colonial rule in Libya, as well as make room for further scholarly interventions into the silenced genocide. What is particularly captivating is Ahmida's articulation of a non-Western and decolonial methodological intervention that centers and makes visible this silenced history by giving voice to those who have been neglected by Eurocentric academia, Italian state amnesia, and self-interested Western powers. In rupturing the silences around the genocide by making foci of the accounts of lived experiences, this rich text embarks on a mission to demystify the Western monopoly of history and knowledge production and shifts the lens to spaces and peoples whose histories and ways of knowing have not been accounted for.

In the first chapter, titled "Where are the Survivors?," Ahmida begins the task of uncovering a genocide that has largely escaped Western history books and scholarly discussions by describing the difficult and lengthy process he undertook to uncover untold stories and hidden archives. What intrigued me most in this chapter was Ahmida's deterrence away from legitimized government archives to draw attention and value to the unvalued and overlooked private archives hidden within the homes of those whose ancestors witnessed the terror of Italian colonialism. The ghost-like presence of these intimate archives in the private and familial setting ruptures the systemic silences by serving as living, communally protected and accepted evidence of the *shar* of Italian genocidal colonial policies in Libya. Moreover, Ahmida details his unorthodox experience of conducting participant interviews by capturing the essence of the postcolonial world, particularly

Libya's societal composition as being inherently communal. Ahmida remarks on how his interviews exemplified the continued living memory of the genocide within Libya's social fabric wherein family members and community members gathered and witnessed as the elderly survivors retold the horrors they saw.

In chapter two, titled "Eurocentricism, Silence, and Memory of Genocide," Ahmida continues to explore the silences around the genocide outside of Libya's social fabric. Particularly, Ahmida examines Western mainstream scholarly and political embellishments of Italian Fascism as lean and rehabilitative. Ahmida contests this dominant narrative by employing a postcolonial theoretical position to argue that the genocide was a deliberate and intentional act wherein Italian Fascists "played into Orientalist fantasies and racist and modernist colonial ideologies, about the dehumanized, backward natives, and the price of modernity to justify the need to 'exterminate all the brutes'" (p. 53). In making this argument, Ahmida then dedicates the remainder of chapter two as well as chapter three, titled "We Died because of *Shar*, Evil my Son," to rupture the Eurocentricism of scholarly and public perceptions that associate genocidal policies with those that occurred within spatial locality of Europe. Ahmida does this by elevating the poetry and oral stories of survivors which spoke of collective hardship in the camps through forced labour, torture, rape and murder, displacement and exile. These poems and survivor stories also expressed perseverance, hope and resistance despite the hardship. In centering the stories of survivors as a means by which to understand and uncover a brutal history of genocidal intent and action, these two chapters arguably serve as the most crucial aspects of the book by legitimizing the voices and ways of knowing of Libyans which have been deliberately overlooked and delegitimized. In doing so, Ahmida provides an opening for a discussion on and critique of Italian Fascist genocidal policies in Libya.

In chapter four, titled "After the Genocide," Ahmida revisits the global silences post-genocide, by examining the Cold War and the self-interest of the US and its allies in disregarding the brutality of Italian fascist genocidal policies to forge an alliance with Italy against the Soviet communists. Moreover, in this densely informative chapter, Ahmida goes on to trace the postcolonial Libyan state's responses and the differing social and political contexts in which the genocide is remembered and at times disregarded. Among the various analyses and discussions, Ahmida briefly mentions and strongly condemns Ita-

ly's 2008 ambiguous apology as devoid of a true intent for restoration and reparation. According to Ahmida, the apology does not attempt to break the silences around the genocide as it neglects to adequately correct the romanticized narrative of Italian history nor make an effort to restore the campsites as a means by which to recover the physical evidence of the atrocities.

Chapter five, titled "Postscript: Rethinking Postcolonial State Formation, Crisis, and Collapse" is used by Ahmida to provide an overview of his calculated decision to provide a decolonized theory that centres the voices of those whose histories have been silenced and in doing so he attempts to depict them not as victims, but as agents "of living culture" (p. 148). He does so with the backdrop of criticism towards the Eurocentricism of political theory and its limiting ways of viewing the world through a Western lens. Moreover, Ahmida goes on to rupture Western Enlightenment constructs of static and linear historical time to provide a postcolonial analysis that examines the current crises of the Libyan state as directly rooted in the settler colonialism of Italy and the "contradictions that the modern Libyan state created in the shadow of settler colonialism" (p. 149). He argues that the return of anti-colonial symbols and memories during the Libyan revolution of 2011 can rupture European static temporal time and reveal the ways in which history is very much rooted in the present.

Through this exceptional text, Ahmida provides insightful, captivating and engaging arguments and discussions on the brutal realities of Italian Fascism's colonial genocidal policies and its afterlives by centering the perspectives of those who bear witnessed and kept the memory alive in Libya's social conscious. In taking a postcolonial theoretical standing and decolonial methodological approaches, Ahmida attempts to write history in ways that Western Eurocentric scholarship has often overlooked and delegitimized. This book serves as an enriched attempt to make the case for Italian colonial genocidal rule in Libya by making visible the five years of *shar* and the silenced voices that witnessed it. At times, this seemed like a large and hastened undertaking that ebbs and flows between ideas with little support from theoretical literature that engages in and builds on such ideas. As a result, a rushed and often lacking theoretical engagement of ideas and concepts left readers unable to fully digest and savor the complexities and richness of Ahmida's mission. While briefly drawing on critical scholarship that criticized Italian fascism, like that of Antonio Gramsci

and Hannah Arendt, as well as postcolonial anti-colonial scholarship, like that of Frantz Fanon, Ahmida does not construct a strong theoretical presence in the book, that not only allows for a better understanding of the colonial project in Libya but also the need to elevate other forms of knowledge to understand history holistically.

In line with this critique is the glaring anti-analysis of the role of women in keeping these memories alive. Throughout the book, Ahmida mentions in passing the ways in which women played a significant role both in his own recollection of the *shar* and its continued afterlife in the Libyan national fabric through the poetry of women survivors and women's transfer of such recollections in the everyday. In centering alternative methodologies, like that of oral tradition and poetry, Ahmida misses a great opportunity to grapple with and insert into his own analysis the works of feminist theoretical traditions that have explored how alternative transfers of knowledge, passed through women, have allowed for people to recollect outside of dominant ways of knowing.¹ Arguably, Ahmida's lack of theoretical rigor was intentional as this book is a preliminary introduction into understanding the Libyan genocide and its hidden history. After all, he concludes by stating (p. 174), "hopefully [this book] will not be read as the last word on the

-
- 1 Notably, the following sources in particular: Anna M. Agathangelou, "Making Anew an Arab Regional Order? On Poetry, Sex and Revolution," *Globalizations* 8/5 (2011), 581–594; Anna M. Agathangelou & Kyle D. Killian, "Epistemologies of Peace: Poetics, Globalization and the Social Justice Movement," *Globalizations* 3/4 (2006), 459–483; Patricia H. Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (Vol. 2), (New York: Routledge, 2000); Nokuthula Hlabangane, "Can Methodology Subvert the Logics of its Principal? Decolonial Mediations," *Persepectives on Science* 26/6 (2018), 658–693; bell hooks, "Choosing the Margin as a Space of Radical Openness," in *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*, ed. Sandra G. Harding (New York: Routledge, 2004), 153–159; Linda Tuhiwai Smith, "Imperialism, History, Writing and Theory," in *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, ed. Linda Tuhiwai Smith (London & New York: Zed Books, 2012), 57–90; Shaira Vadasaria, "Anti-Colonial poetics: A methodology from and for Palestine," in *Imaginative Inquiry: Innovative Approaches to Interdisciplinary Research*, ed. Curtis Fogel, Andrea Quinlan, & Elizabeth Quinlan (Washington, DC: Academica Press, 2013), 167–181.

Libyan genocide, but as a call for more research and examination of the hard questions and perhaps a decolonization of colonial and fascist knowledge and a decentering of genocide studies.”



Qtelni ash-shar

In Algeria, the word *shar* (شَرّ) developed different meanings after French colonization. Though the Arabic word *shar* literally translates to ‘evil’, in Algerian Arabic, however, *shar* also means ‘hunger’. In a present-day context, *shar* can be used to express hunger dramatically: *qtelni ash-shar*, literally ‘hunger killed me’, expresses being very hungry. However, the word’s historical roots are steeped in poverty and famine under French occupation. This particular meaning of ‘hunger’ developed after a period of famine in 1866–1868 which was a direct result of French colonial malevolence and led to tens of thousands of Algerian deaths. A complex series of factors led to the famine, including shortages of labor, limited grain storage, a lack of cash, and the grave miscalculations of the French colonial government that over-exported Algerian crops to France.

Consequently, hunger gradually became synonymous with evil. That period of history is captured in the well-known painting *Famine en Algérie* (1868) by Gustave Guillaumet.¹ The painting poignantly depicts meagre naked bodies that turned to greenish yellow because of malnutrition. All eyes in the painting are fixed on a loaf of bread being handed from a high window by a clean white hand with opulent rings and a pearl bracelet; all eyes except those of the dead, the dying, and the grieving who lost hope.

Being Algerian, I grew up as an inheritor of colonial trauma, and, like many others, I believed that French colonialism was the most pernicious of all colonialisms. But *Genocide in Libya: Shar, a Hidden Colonial History* (2021) opened my eyes to the suffering of Libyans under Italian colonization. Written by the Libyan researcher and polit-

1 See Gustave Guillaumet, *Tableaux algériens* (Paris: Plon, 1888–1891), <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k57894284>

ical scientist Ali Abdullatif Ahmida, the book is piercingly poignant on the breadth of colonial *shar*. It is now shameful to confess, but I, erroneously, had believed that Italian colonialism was more benevolent when compared to French colonialism. Through the oral testimony of Libyan survivors, and Ahmida's sharp analysis, the reader of this book is bound to face an irreversible and inevitable truth: all colonialism is evil. This ground-breaking investigation of the forgotten Libyan genocide uncovers the obscured history of the fascist Italian concentration camps, particularly of the years 1929-1934. The book also connects the Libyan genocide to the colonial roots of the Holocaust and genocide studies through comparative and cross-cultural readings.

The testimonials gathered by Ahmida show that, despite the efforts deployed to move on from a dark and gruesome chapter in history, the concentration camps became a living moment of cultural formation. Thousands of Libyans died between 1929 and 1934 because of murder, deportations, and incarceration conducted and supervised by Italian fascists. Abductions, enforced disappearances, forced displacement, and imprisonment in 16 different concentration camps; this was the story that Libyans documented and bequeathed to future generations through their oral traditions.

How many people know about the Holocaust? But how many people know about the concentration camps in Libya? And how many people know that the Italian concentration camps in Libya were a blueprint of the Holocaust? The answers to these questions will unquestionably raise awareness about our collective lack of knowledge regarding colonial genocides. Ahmida brilliantly reveals facts that remained hidden from most history books, for example, "The use of gas to exterminate people was first applied in Libya in 1929 and then in Ethiopia in 1935" (p. 10). These facts are both shocking and enraging: how and why do we not learn about this in our schools? This lack of knowledge—or selective knowledge to be more precise—was the impetus for Ahmida's research questions. The book also makes one realize that when it comes to cultural studies, the quality of research is determined by the researcher's willingness to stand within culture and study it. Standing apart, within one's comfort zone, does not suffice.

The book presents multidisciplinary readings of cultural representations, narratives, and primary sources. The chapters are interlaced, and the book cross-examines the archival, oral, literary, and theoretical sources and debates from Libya, Africa generally, and Europe. The book rightfully asks and answers: "who writes history? It is not

just historians but also journalists, cartoonists, poets, politicians, university lecturers, religious figures, novelists, and bureaucrats hired by the state to write school text and set exam questions" (p. 148).

The politics of colonial and Arabic sources and archives are critiqued and mapped in chapter one. This chapter also shows the author's reflective and ethical concerns in locating and obtaining information. Chapter two examines the historiography of Italian Fascism, as well as the issues of genocide and silence. It concludes with an introduction to orality and poetry as forms of cultural transmission. Survivors' testimonials, oral narratives, and poems are featured in chapter three. This chapter gives new insight on forced deportation and how age, gender, and class influenced the chances of survival and demise. This new material reconstructs a complicated social history of a surviving culture in eastern Libya; a history that survived state and elite control both during and after colonization. Chapter four traces the harsh experiences of imprisonment and its aftermath after survival. The beginnings of the modern state are outlined in chapter five: Libya transitioned from monarchy to republic to dictatorship between 1951 and 1969, and between 1977 and 2011. The conclusion returns to the book's core critical questions, with a critique of Eurocentrism.

Ahmida argues that the massacres of Libyans fit the requirements defined by the father of modern genocide studies, Raphael Lemkin. In his argument, Ahmida draws on two conditions of qualification put forward in 1948 at the UN Convention by Lemkin, a Polish legal scholar: The intentionality of killing and the destruction of physical, biological, and cultural patterns of life. For these reasons, the book suggests that the Holocaust was a re-manifestation of colonial genocide. Thus, the book does not only open our eyes to the colonial genocide in Libya in particular, but it also invites us to re-examine the Holocaust as a "colonial case and that the Libyan case contributed directly to its making" (p. 173).

One of the most interesting films about the Holocaust is *Kapo* (1960) directed by Gillo Pontecorvo, who might be more remembered by North Africans for his world-famous film *The Battle of Algiers* (1966). 'Kapo' refers to an imprisoned overseer at a Nazi concentration camp. Centering the experience of a young Jewish girl who becomes a kapo, Pontecorvo's film explores the complex relationships between Nazi dehumanization of victims and how resistance re-valorizes life. Ahmida's book also, taking a similar angle, bravely tackles the dark history of Libyan collaborators who served fascists as advisors, guards,

guides, and so forth. Moreover, the book's descriptions of the Italian concentration camps in Libya evokes the same images from both Pontecorvo films, bringing Ahmida's argument to full prominence: the concentration camps in Libya were the inspiration for the Holocaust and the Holocaust was the legacy of colonialism. As the book shows, the Holocaust is founded in and modelled after colonial genocides in Africa, particularly the Rwandan slaughter and the Libyan concentration camps. Ahmida's study also adds to the copious body of evidence that the Nazis were directly interested in the fascist Italian government's activities.

This new and original history of the genocide is a key resource for readers interested in genocide and Holocaust studies, colonial and postcolonial studies, and African and Middle Eastern studies. To be sure, Algerian studies that focus on cross-examining Maghrebi colonial trauma would undoubtedly benefit from Ahmida's research. I believe it is also a must-read for anyone serious about learning the dark history of colonial evil, as well as the creative and steadfast efforts of decolonization, with survival being the first step of resisting fascism and *shar*.



Rising from *Shar*: A Meditation on the Future of our History

I.

These roads will take you into your own country.
Muriel Rukeyser

With the hindsight of nearly five decades, I can say that the experiences that shaped my national identity, and gave me the sense of my country, were several long road trips along the Libyan coastal highway. A merchant in Benghazi, my father's business took him all the way to Tobruk 500 kilometers in the east, and to Ajdabiya 150 kilometers southwest of Benghazi, and all the cities in between. Three times a year, he took my cousins, my brother and myself on these trips. The road to Derna was a sensory immersion in the beauty of nature, the mountains, the greenery, the scent of the shrubbery, and in winter and spring, a sense of bounty, the land covered with vegetation, a glint of gold on the grass in the sunshine, a silver sheen in the rain. We were always well provisioned on these trips, and it seems to me that we stopped as many times to eat and enjoy the scenery as we did to conduct my father's business. The food we had with us was unlike what we ate daily—drier food so things don't spill in the car—and so much of it, enough for a grand picnic, and so delicious because it marked us as travelers, eating on the side of the road, surrounded by beautiful scenery and the purest air.

On these trips each city projected its own identity. Al-Marj, when we were travelling to it a decade or so after the devastating earthquake 1961, which the King Idris government was quick to rebuild. It was an orderly town where cows and sheep roamed among the sharp modern white villas. The entry into Al-Baida with its giant eucalyptus trees alongside the city entrance, followed by the great university campus, made a stately impression of power and leisure, worthy of a summer capital. One had to stop in Shahhat, Cyrene, because one simply must

acknowledge *al-athar*, the mysterious Greek ruins, and perhaps to reminisce about a great hotel that closed soon after the 1969 coup d'état. Derna was the jewel of the trip, a beautiful city that in my eye competed with our sprawling and pulsating Benghazi. The city's fine grand hotel was the first I ever stayed in, its elegant restaurant and coffeeshop resembled anything one would have encountered in Italy then. Derna had a brand of soda, Sadaqa, that was all its own and it came in all the colors of the rainbow, and none of them were available in Benghazi. A famous Cretan restaurant must have served a version of the mythical lotus soaked in secret elixirs because everyone that had eaten there never forgot it, and always wished to return. At night one could go to an open roofed cinema or walk the narrow, jasmine scented streets. The trip to Tobruk was longer and less green. Scene of great WWII battles, and until 1970's site of a major British military base, Tobruk looked to the world with its strategic wide harbor, a vista that resonated with import and intrigue. This made the return westward toward the Green Mountains even sweeter, another chance to experience the hedonism that the ancient philosophers of Cyrene had preached long ago. We were innocent of the horrific journeys that trod these mountains only a few decades before.

Travel to Tripoli was always cause for excitement. Indeed, the Tripoli of my youth, bigger, more built-up and cleaner than Benghazi, seemed to evoke sleek and glamorous Europe. We had relatives in Tripoli to visit and stay with, sometimes all summer long. Boarding the famed, and later infamous, 727s of Libyan Arab Airlines was how I first traveled to the nation's capital. Something of that thrill remains with me now when I take window seat and try to place myself a dot on the map, the long haul over the Gulf of Sidra, then a clutch of cities, Misrata, Zlitan, Khoms, Garabulli, until landing into the lap of 'Arous al-Bahr.

As impacting as these travels have been on my sense of rootedness as a Libyan, a citizen who belongs to several parts of the same nation, it was two road journeys between Tripoli and Benghazi that gave me a deeper and perhaps more sobering sense of my country. Driving southward from Benghazi on the coastal highway, and soon after leaving the famous trees of Teeka behind, the rugged, desert landscape begins to engulf the riders. And as the car begins to reach high speed, cars from the other direction will begin to shoot past at a hundred miles an hour. The journey begins to feel like a daunting task that no one wants to take, preferring instead to speed through it, as soon—as insanely soon—as possible.

The most prevalent image of the coastal highway as one fol-

lowed the arc of the Gulf of Sidra is the mirage, the bright mercurial shimmer of water that always shone a few kilometers ahead of you on the burning asphalt and, which as the trip continues, begins to seem like the force that made drivers become maniacal, as they sped toward it and never reaching it. It was in the middle of this hot, oppressively bright landscape that my uncle, also chasing the mirage, pointed to his right and said, "This is where they killed all those poor people long ago. Al-Agila! The Italians. God curse them." Looking through the open window, there was nothing to see, except apparitions half standing in the middle of nowhere. History was before us, but it was also a mirage.

I do not recall if the camp was on the right/north or left/south side of the coastal highway. Although barely a thread of asphalt separating desert from sea, the road was a mental barrier for many like me who lived on the coast and never looked southward. Even when I tried to imagine the long journey, *rihlan*, that my clan took from Misrata to Egypt in 1923, I naturally thought they followed the coastal route which had not been built then. A conversation with my father in my twenties revealed a different lay of the land. When they were expelled from Misrata after the city fell to the fascists, my ancestors, regrouped as several hundred, headed south/southwest to al-Sadadah, nearly 100 kilometers away. I track that line on the map. Nearly a year later they ended up in the oasis of Al-Jaghub, right on the Egyptian border, but 300 kilometers from the coast. They certainly did not take the coastal road but followed a centuries-old route among the desert oases that connected ancient Egypt to Carthage, and both ancient civilizations to the Sahel, all the way to the River Niger.

But where did the ancestors stop, and how far south did they go before they swerved eastward? Sokna, Waddan, certainly Jalu and Awjila. In Al-Jaghub, they waited for permission to enter Egypt, where the British blocked them from moving on. The League of Nations, so the story goes, intervened. At last, they entered Egypt with Italian identity documents, expelled but somehow recognized by the European power that tormented and uprooted them. Many died along the *tirhal*, but somewhere along the year-long journey my father was born.

In a more benign interpretation of our mad, leisurely, and agonizing crossings of our land, I imagined that we Libyans were sewing our scattered, tattered country together with our journeys. It is indeed a thrill, albeit a disorienting one, to travel so far and deep and to remain in one's country.

II.

Beyond (and sometimes even within) people's memories was undated time, historical darkness. Out of that darkness (extending to place as well as time) we had all come.
V. S. Naipaul

144

Like many Libyans I learned about Al-Agila and the other Italian concentration camps in intermittent doses. A television program drama, perhaps, a short black and white film about Ghaith al-Saghir. The melodrama and the overacting betrayed the national sense of grievance, and misapprehension of the trauma that took place. A seemingly long and endless reel of a young broadcaster shoving a microphone in front ancient people and asking them to render their pain as quickly as they can. By the time Qaddafi began to put his Third Universal Theory in practice, with its cult of personality propaganda pervading the ether and the public sphere, references to the trauma of the Italian concentration camps began to disappear. The revolution had made its case against imperialism and colonialism and now the glorious leader and his three green pamphlets are ready to storm the world. The time was a time of victors, not victims.

And this momentum of leaving history behind, driving past it along the coastal highway, or chucking it aside when the trumpets of destiny begin to herald a new future, has been with us all along. For the Brits victory in North Africa resulted in their utter neglect of any pursuit of war crimes against the murderous Italian generals. The newly established Libyan monarchy, dirt poor and unable to take on its former colonizers, many of whom controlled most the country's economy, pushed headway into the future. And when the oil came, the petrol induced frenzy, the clanking of the oil wells and the hard currency pouring in, along with the aging monarch's bafflement before the ideological currents that swirled around his kingdom, made contemplation of the past seem like a luxury.

Yet, for many Libyans, impressions of the camps did remain, some sharp and resonant and otherwise uncertain but evocative as the students Professor Ahmida interviewed testified. Indeed, the verse *ما بي مرض غير دار العقيلة* ('I have no illness except the abode of Al-Agila') which opens Rajab Buhwaish's great ode is seared on the Libyan aural memory. And along with the image of Omar al-Mukhtar (sometimes in the guise of Anthony Quinn), it is one of the primary memory triggers of the nation's past. It's ironic that as much as the Qaddafi regime had affiliated itself with the heroism of al-Mukhtar and the anti-Italian ji-

had, this same tradition was ultimately utilized as a potent symbol in the rebellion that brought down the 42-year-old dictatorship. In 2011, Libyans found no difficulty identifying themselves with al-Mukhtar and the victims of Italian brutality, while comparing Qaddafi and his henchmen to the Italian occupiers who oppressed the nation, corrupted the land, and defiled the bodies of the citizenry with killings and torture. Of note here too is that both during the Qaddafi regime and in the rebellion against him, the identification focused on the fighters, who by virtue of being rewarded eternal paradise, were themselves victorious even in defeat. The identification was not with the masses killed in the camps, many of whom remain unnamed. Also in the 2011 rebellion, the crucial contribution of the Abu Salim victims, being presented as evidence of Qaddafi's brutality, was soon neglected, the population opting for an elusive victorious past rather than a painful history that can perhaps be known and documented.

As opposed to history, the past is brittle, the legends recounted around which identities are shaped can quickly fall apart. Libya is full of attempts to create such pasts, mainly in the form of mini-tribal biographies written by pseudo historians who created for their tribes and tribal heroes histories that trace their genealogies to the purest native blood, or the mightiest conquerors. In such "histories" of tribal heroes, one's ancestors emerge as unblemished paragons, who spared the nation no act of courage, who never tasted defeat, never abused their neighbors, acted on greed, or cowered, collaborated or betrayed tribe or nation. Reading such versions of the Libyan past, one must wonder why the nation has fared so badly, with the same internecine violence, flaring up at the first decades of the 21st century as it had in the 20th, and where acts of disloyalty and contempt sometimes overshadow deeds of courage and goodwill.

Indeed, I am thinking of the unaccounted for, and unacknowledged betrayal and collaboration during Italian colonization. It's evident that a sizeable number of Libyans from all over Libya had been recruited from as early as 1912 to fight with the Italians against other Libyans, and that there were Libyans responsible for other Libyans' suffering. Accounting for such a fact may seem inconvenient for the creation of a national myth. Indeed, such an effort at truth and reconciliation was not possible after WWII, when poor and battered Libya was attempting to gain statehood through the world powers via the U.N. During the era of King Idris, the country still bore regional fractures that needed tending. The country was also harangued by Nasserite propaganda that spread lies against it to explain away its short-

comings and was encircled by the oceanic tensions of the Cold War and the Arab-Israeli conflict. Libyans were never allowed a moment of peace to sift through their history, and solidify it their understanding of it, through recognition and forgiveness. The age of oil with its heady rumble of development and dizzying possibilities for enrichment made history seem a minor nuisance. The enrichment of the nation itself seemed a reward from God, in accordance with the Quranic promise of “after hardship there is ease.” God himself seemed to have pushed us into the future.

The Qaddafi regime, as stated earlier, had little patience with history even as its institutions had made the most inroads into chronicling such history, such as with the collection of archives and ethnographies which Professor Ahmida’s study references. Perhaps as a point of tact, though I doubt it very much, Qaddafi’s propagandists could not persist in condemning the atrocities of the Italian occupation, when they themselves began to commit their own audacious atrocities. The public hangings of the Libyan mujahideen which had signified the brutality of Italian colonization were replicated in the late 1970’s and 1980s, in universities, public squares, and sports arenas. Atrocities such as the summary executions, torture, beatings, unjust trials, expulsions, and indefinite detentions which had been faced by our ancestors during the Italian era were a fact of life for Libyans in much of the Qaddafi era. People would have seen through his cynicism, and the Colonel seeing no benefit in solidifying the nation’s history to his advantage, cooled off on such chores.

Ten years now since the rebellion that toppled Qaddafi, it seems evident the Libyan leadership or intelligentsia is incapable of addressing history. The Abu Salim massacre, which more than any other atrocity in the Qaddafi era contributed to the regime’s downfall, remains as inscrutable now as it was when it was first revealed 20 years ago. And sadly, as the revelations of the recent Kaniyat reign of terror in Tarhuna continue to abhor us, among many other atrocities committed by the combatants in our current civil strife, we are a long way off from any reconciliation. As was the case during the Colonel’s era, any attempt now to address the Qaddafi regime’s atrocities, in isolation, will seem cynical given the fact that powerful forces in Libya have been engaged in wholesale murder, disappearance, and torture.

A century or so after the onset of colonization in Libya, the colonized have been caught in a cycle of violence among themselves. And one can make a very good argument that indeed Libya’s fiery modern history is not a set of separate fires, but a continuous burning that

began with the first sparks of Italian colonial violence in 1911. The territorial tensions and animosities that had flared during the Italian era, pro-Sanussi in the East and anti-Sanussi elsewhere, Arab vs. Amazigh, coastal towns vs. hinterlands, soldered over during the monarchy, and silenced during the Qaddafi era, blazed back to life during the 2011 rebellion. Such conflicts, while seemingly intractable, are made much worse without serious efforts to understand them and their roots, which is what serious history is about. As to truth and reconciliation, the two words should and ought not be separated. You can't reconcile without the truth. Groups cannot reconcile by lobbing their heroic mythologies at each other. They do so by counting the dead, naming the culprits, and addressing the grievances, a process that has yet to take place in Libya, not in our internal conflicts, and not even in the case of the criminal Italian violence inflicted upon us and that exacerbated our antagonisms.

The nation's leaders, old and new, seem to view history as an inconvenient burden, an obstacle on the fast highway of nation making. In fact, as Libyan novelist Wafa al-Buissi recently observed in an interview, Libyans insist on foggy versions of the past as their blueprint of the future. She writes,

As for the general public, they quarrel over the past, some of them want to restore the chaotic, corrupt regime of Qaddafi, although they let him down and fled from it the first week of the February uprising.

Some of them want to restore the monarchy, and most of them did not live through that period and know little about it.

And the rest want to restore the Prophet's state, and they forgot that if it was a good state, whole tribes from Mecca would not have renounced Islam and returned to it only submissively.

Very few Libyans think about the future.¹

What impresses me most in al-Buissi's observation is the link she makes between the past and the future. Those who insist on a glorious past, and who want to relive the past as if one can plug oneself into like an electronic instrument, along with those who do not know their history, cannot build the future. Unfortunately, these propagators of

1 Wafa Al-Buissi, Interview with *Libya Al-Mustakbal* (9/29/21), <https://www.libya-al-mostakbal.org/94/29958/البعيسى-أراقب-العالم-الغبي-من-مكاني-وهو-يعود-القهرى-بطء-شديد.html>

time-travel have become powerful forces that silence all attempts at dealing rationally with the present, which is how the future is made. Nonetheless, in the case of the Italian genocide and the internal atrocities that have taken place since, Libya's history has been the opposite of Shelly's Ozymandias. Repeatedly those in power have tried to bury it, but it has repeatedly risen from the sand demanding resolution.

III.

*What three things can never be done?
Forget. Keep silent. Stand alone*
Muriel Rukeyser

History and memory create an arena of the politics of the present.
Ali Ahmida

In addition to being a poignant and authoritative reminder of our history and its distinct historiography, Professor Ahmida's *Genocide in Libya: Shar, A Hidden Colonial History*, is a significant contribution to the way we perceive and can potentially rearticulate Libyan identity. Particularly, I note his attempt to decenter genocide studies from its European locus and its positioning as an epiphenomenon limited to the Holocaust, toward seeing it as an evolutionary form of violence that began in Africa with deep roots in the Americas. Doubtless, the Italians learned from the Cherokee Trail of Tears, as well as from the British treatment of the Boers, in the same way that the Nazis examined the Italian genocide in Libya, as Professor Ahmida establishes, to structure the hellish machinery of the Holocaust. Decentering the horrors of genocide in the modern age and narrating them as a continuum can have the impact of uniting the victims by creating a genealogy of suffering based in empathy and solidarity, rather than isolation and paranoia. Decentering the fascist genocide for Libyans from a peculiarly violent, demoralizing and isolating experience and placing it within the continuum of violence of the modern era will allow them to see their national history as part of a larger context. The genocide may then cease to be an isolated, localized trauma worthy only of repression, but as stage in modern history where violence and inhumanity rose to unprecedented levels, but where they like other victims of genocide and colonial violence fought valiantly and nobly to sustain their humanity.

Repositioning the fascist genocide in Libya as part of a historical evolution will perhaps encourage Libyans to see it as a development

that arose from a complicated series of events and political choices. While the Italians were indeed the overwhelmingly more powerful agents in this historical epoch, Libyans acted with a great deal of determination for at least a decade, defeating the Italians in several battles and limiting their control to the cities until the early 1920s. One would also have to reconsider the wisdom of the Sanussi leadership joining the Ottomans' fight against the British in WWI when they could least afford to, and considerably weakening their ability to fight their enemy, the Italians. And, as well documented by Libyan historians, Libyans also fought amongst each other as well.

And for the sake of historical veracity, I must recount an incident that rattled my own understanding of genocide in Libya. On a visit to Ajdabiya in the early 2000s, I met a respected elderly sheikh who had survived the camps. He was a teenager at the time. As the conversation flowed, I mentioned the capture of Omar al-Mukhtar, referring to it as our great shared tragedy. But the sheikh shocked me when he said, "What a blessed day it was! It was the day they began to let us out of the camps."

I had never heard this point of view of the genocide, never expected to hear any view that deeply questioned Omar al-Mukhtar's jihad. The other people in the room were bemused, for they knew that the sheikh's view of the genocide experience was unacceptable to the Qaddafi regime and among the general public. But the sheikh spoke fearlessly and what he said came from the experience of actually living in the camps, suffering the horrors, abuse, and starvation that Professor Ahmida so well documents. What I'm saying is that the sheikh I met was not a traitor, but a victim of a horrific system that overwhelmed his and his people's ability to endure. Given what we know of the suffering that took place, and despite the honor in which al-Mukhtar has been held, I don't think that my sheikh's point was idiosyncratic, but one that has been thoroughly repressed.

The question this suppressed point of view raises is, what did the victims of the camps think of al-Mukhtar's ongoing jihad at that time? And what did he and his fellow fighters think as they learned of what was happening to the hundreds of thousands of people dying of disease, torture, and starvation in the camps? Did the struggle to "victory or death" go on too long? And even as we view it as a component of our national identity, can we also, as a useful and necessary engagement in negative capability, recognize al-Mukhtar's noble jihad in the late 1920s as also a doomed cause?

It is telling that in 2011, at the beginning of the anti-Qaddafi rebellion, Libyans recalled the legacy of al-Mukhtar and the other anti-Italian jihad leaders to inspire them in toppling the regime. It was a time where they felt they had no choice but to fight or die. But to what extent is al-Mukhtar's legacy useful in the process of national rebuilding and reconciliation? Al-Mukhtar was recalled to inspire the fighters during battle, but history is not made up of, and is not made by, fighting alone. A people can also fight by preserving their own lives, by being resilient, preparing themselves better, at home or in exile, for a longer struggle.

I raise these deeply uneasy questions as I forcefully acknowledge that the Italians' aim was indeed to displace the Libyan population from their farmlands, which they did shortly after closing the concentration camps in eastern Libya. It is also clear that the Italians needed the Libyans to serve as semi-enslaved, barely educated labor. The Italians, it should be noted, limited Libyans' education to primary school. This is textbook settler colonialism; otherwise, the enterprise is not profitable without cheap native labor. This was happening in western Libya in the 1920s, and as the sheikh I met in Ajdabiya told me, he and many youths his age, upon being released from the concentration camps, were forcibly recruited to build the coastal highway that I traveled in my youth in the 1970s. In fact, labor was so scarce in 1930s colonial Libya that the Italians were forced to pay Libyan laborers more than their racialized labor wage code had dictated. And as the old sheikh I met in Ajdabiya testified, the forced labor on the coastal road was no walk in the park. Furthermore, Libyans who worked in less labor-intensive jobs were not spared the injustice and daily humiliations of Italian racial supremacy, where Libyans lived under an Italian Jim Crow system. Doubtlessly, the fascist colonial plan was violent, vulgar, and demeaning, but the practical realities of settler colonialism should perhaps allow us to reexamine the variety of circumstances under which the various agents in the colonial struggle had operated. The reader may consider this an invocation to bring the full force and rich trove of postcolonial theory, which has been woefully underutilized in Libyan social and literary studies to study the various means of resistance and the various types of agency experienced in the colonial struggles the world over, some of which could also be discerned in the Libyan colonial experience. To his credit, Professor Ahmida, in his most recent book and in earlier work, has vigorously applied and called for approaching the Libyan experience from the wide range of postcolonial criticism. But it will behoove us at this point to consider other

strategies used by Libyans during the violent Italian era. Indeed, many Libyans did rely on James Joyce's triptych of postcolonial responses, "silence, exile, and cunning," forms of resistance they utilized during their colonial experience but that remain woefully underexplored.

151

Finally, I want to speculate about the role that the Libyan experience and memory of genocide contributes to the Libyan sense of identity. In this case, I want to target the question of how genocide as national history can shape a sense of identity. There are not many nations that have made genocide as a core to their sense of nationhood. In the past few weeks where we have been learning of the Canadian residential school mass graves, we have also been witnessing a recalibration of Canadian history and identity, whereby genocide is being recognized as an integral part of that nation's experience. Germany perhaps more than any other nation in history has made its guilt of committing the Holocaust, and its citizens culpability in it, a central pillar of the nation's world outlook. In the case of Rwanda, a country now ruled by the victims of genocide, it is difficult to gauge to what degree the memory of genocide has become a potentially unifying force. In Armenia, now an independent state, although most ethnic Armenians live abroad, remembering the genocide and widening the circle of recollection has become a national duty. Visitors to Armenia, as far back as the Soviet era, have been forced to confront the memory of the genocide through the numerous memorials to the Armenians' suffering.

In Israel the memory of the Holocaust has become a kind of civil religion, as historian Esther Benbassa has noted, where the Holocaust is emphasized as part of the nation's uniqueness. Most disturbingly for the Palestinians who have been colonized, displaced, and disenfranchised for nearly eight decades, the state of Israel is using the memory of the Holocaust to combat their legitimate rights to their land, to equal rights, and the right of return. In fact, as recent statements by PM Netanyahu demonstrate, Zionists, as far back as 1945, have tried to accuse the Palestinians of recommending the idea of the Holocaust to Adolf Hitler! It's hard to think of anything more brazenly cynical than such a blatant fabrication, but such behavior has become unsurprising in Israeli politics.

This is all to say, that genocide as a component of national identity, and as a marker of national memory, differs from one nation to another. It presents a contentious legacy that can never be free from political manipulation and divisiveness. Recovering the memory of

genocide as a means of enhancing our imagined community, would require a conscious and well-organized effort to teach, preserve, and integrate history among the whole population, and making it a shared, accessible, and examinable part of the nation's heritage. This is what needs to happen to Libya's fascist genocide trauma, and to all our legacies of trauma.

I began this part of the essay with an invocation from the poet Muriel Rukeyser that we should never "Forget. Keep silent. Stand alone." Indeed, these are the same precepts that Professor Ahmida's remarkable book invokes us to do regarding Libya's experience of genocide and his book serves in some ways as a guidebook on how to do all of Rukeyser's invocations. History does not only tell us what happened. When well-told and deeply probed it opens our eyes into unknown facets of human behavior and changes our sense of given landscapes and the rituals of the people who live on them. Widening our imaginations as such, it invokes upon us to think of what could have been and recruits us into shaping human destiny by leading us to imagine what needs to be done. To repair the homeland, to bring the human carnage to an end.



Ayet Innej: The Oasis Folks^{*}

|

In a remote corner of the desert lived a small group of people next to a water spring they named Ghasouf.[†] There, they made a beautiful home around the oasis and called it 'Ademus, and were, henceforth, known as Ayet 'Ademus or the 'Ademus folks.[‡] They lived peacefully in the oasis for a very long time. The oasis folks bore secrets as countless as the grains of the desert sand and so heavy even mountains could not bear them.

In the desert, alongside the oasis folks, lived the underworld folks. Each claimed the land as their own, although neither knew who truly had the right to it. Thus, they vowed to live alongside each other in peace and did so for ages. They even shared the land and its profits. People of the oasis controlled the surface and named themselves Ayet Innej, the oasis folks, while their invisible neighbors made the underground their home and were known as Ayet Adda, the underworld folks.

ابراهيم الإمام، آيت أنج (دار الكتب الوطنية: بنغازي، 2015) *

'Crocodile' (غسوف) in the Ghadamsi Berber language, named so because there were many crocodiles in the area in past times. †

'Ghadames' (غديمس) in the Ghadamsi language. ‡

But whenever two different, opposing sides live together, trouble is destined to follow. No matter how long their friendship may have grown into a lofty tree, there will come a time when a black crow or an ominous owl alights on the tree's branches, boding gloomy days. This is life, after all.



One sin can lead to calamity. For sin is like a deep hole, beckoning ever more sinners to answer its call, sinking into its depths. It takes but a single sin to spark an eternal conflict between creatures on earth. As for forgiveness, it is like a weed, easy to pull from one's heart once it sprouts, easy to discard, and easy to render lifeless. To fill the void, another plant grows in its place, extends its roots and blossoms. It grows and grows till it fills every corner in one's heart, but it looks nothing like the weed that preceded it. It is much more stubborn, much more difficult to pull out.

It is only a matter of time before one side commits a small sin. The sin leads to a conflict, and the conflict ends in war. A war in which all is fair play, even the forbidden methods. In such circumstances, a sin is a calamity. And a sin was committed.



No one remembers how or even when the conflict started, only that later generations suffered its bitter consequences. In the oasis, stories were told of the underworld folks' fierceness in war. Legend has it that it was conflict over land that ignited the war between the two sides. It is said that the underworld folks failed to conquer the oasis, despite their numerous attempts.

Patience, however, is key.

The underworld folks waited, patiently and quietly, confident that their patience would bear fruit. They knew that one day, one of the oasis folks was bound to make a mistake – to commit a sin. They waited tirelessly as decades passed. Time meant nothing to them; only two things mattered: carelessness and forgetfulness.



Stories varied on how the underworld folks came to occupy the oasis land, yet one of the stories can certainly be true. Some said the under-

world folks took advantage of a deserted house in the oasis to make their move.

The story behind the deserted house, however, was vague. Some said the war was caused by a conflict over inherited property rights, which led family members to desert the premises altogether and avoid further family contention. The house remained empty for years till its walls cracked and their opponent, the underworld folks, eventually possessed it. Yet others said its owners left the oasis to do trade. Some of the owners left, overcame homesickness, and never returned; others passed away. The house was left deserted and uninhabitable for many years. Another story was that the reason behind the underworld folks taking over the deserted house was not dispute or absence, but an omen. The family's firstborn passed away, then the loss of a second son soon followed. The family viewed these deaths as an ominous sign, subsequently forcing them to abandon the place. They moved to a neighboring house and had a third child. This child was healthy and strong, and most importantly, escaped the deadly fate of his brothers. This, no doubt, was proof enough to the family that their previous residence was cursed. And so, they abandoned it for good.

Sellers tried to sell the house, but the rumors surrounding it reached every family in the oasis. Despite its dirt-cheap price, no one would buy such an ominous place. The underworld folks took advantage of the deserted house and, given the oasis folks' inattentiveness, occupied it for many years.



One day a man walked into the deserted house. He was never the same. At first, the oasis folks thought he was sick with some disease. They took him to the doctor to be examined but were told there was nothing wrong with him physically. The family was relieved at first, but their concerns grew as they watched their loved one turn into anything but normal. He was never again his old self. All the skilled doctors in the oasis failed to diagnose his illness, let alone heal him. The family tried everything, including traditional medicine. They even sought help from caravans that traveled through the oasis. All their attempts failed. They approached an old black man from the caravan. Though he was a stranger, they asked for his help out of desperation. The man muttered a few spells and made the sick man a drink of mixed potions. The ill man vomited strange things but still did not heal. His folks lost faith and abandoned him.

The poor fellow walked the streets and alleys of the oasis – bare-foot, clothes tattered. No one knew how he ate or where he slept. Children at first feared him and ran away but soon scoffed at him for fun.



It was by coincidence that they finally realized he was possessed.

He had disappeared for a few days. No one knew anything of his whereabouts. Then he suddenly reappeared at a wedding party. He stood there completely still, like a rock. The dancers at the wedding cleared the dance floor for him, but he continued to stand there – frozen. The guests moved their bodies to the rhythm of the music, sang, and clapped their hands, encouraging him to dance along, but they failed to make him move a muscle. The instrument players played another tune, the drummers joined in with their beats, and the guests clapped along. They all played and clapped to exhaustion. The man didn't move until one of his close friends whispered something to one of the players. The friend asked the player to play a tune the possessed used to love. The player complied and played the music.

The guests started singing the lyrics and shaking their heads to the beat. All eyes were on the still rock standing in the middle. Finally, they saw him move his head first. They kept repeating the song over and over, even though traditions of the oasis forbade repeating the same tune at one party. But rules can be broken. Their excitement grew, and their palms became sore from clapping so hard. The man then opened his arms wide at the tenth round of the song, moved his feet to the beat, and started dancing with the music. The players kept playing their instruments even though they were growing short of breath, and their faces were turning red. New players had to join to allow the others a respite. The music played as he danced and danced like they had never seen him dance before. They all stood there, amazed by him as he danced, drowned in his sweat, till he passed out at dawn. That night was the talk of the oasis. When he woke up the next morning, they said he regained his senses, but only for a few minutes. He then fell into a deep coma that finally took his life.

The oasis folks started whispering and rumors turned into accusations. The deceased's close friend was furious for losing him twice – once when he lost his mind and spirit and then when he lost his body. He was the first to point a finger at the underworld folks. Others supported him and condemned the violation of the peace truce between

the two nations. It was a blatant assault. The death of their friend marked the start of an unavoidable war.



The war began.

Starting a war is easy, ending one never is. War destroys everything.

Breaking the truce and ending the peace was a great concern to the oasis folks. Their revenge was severe. The underworld folks struck back just as hard. The war between them stretched through time. It was passed down from one generation to the next, leaving behind broken men. It was a dirty war that went on for centuries. Unconventional methods were used – the oasis folks used shrouds of spells to protect themselves from their enemy. While they usually succeeded in blocking them, there were times when the underworld folks managed to break through using their most advantageous weapon – invisibility.

At first, it was a war between men and battles of cavalry and heroes. And the oasis folks won most of the battles.

Fearing extinction, the underworld folks were forced to re-strategize. It was an unorthodox decision, but all necessary measures had to be taken. They recruited their women to the war, not only by consulting them and using their wit in trickery, but also by arming them as soldiers to fight in battle.

The scales turned.

The women of the oasis were kept away from the war. They cheered for their men in poems and songs they sang at weddings. They did not need to fight in a war their men were easily winning. But desperation urged the defeated to take any measures to win the war.

Messengers went back and forth between the two sides – the oasis folks demanded an explanation while the underworld folks replied in their defense, “How can we exclude from the fight the ones who are most affected by it! Women suffer the greatest damage in war by losing a father, a son, a brother, and worst of all, a husband. Not only will they participate in battle, but they will also take the lead.”

The underworld folks were advancing.

The oasis folks needed a new plan, but this time it would not come from the countless wise men whose advice had thus far proven

fruitless. They needed a way out, the wisdom that would win them the war against their wicked foe. They had suffered enough loss and pain. It was time to execute a plan that would make the underworld folks scratch their heads.



The men of Tofretha – the city council – gathered but reached a dead-end, the wise men were unable to find a solution and put an end to the fight, and the people of the oasis were waiting. Members of the council debated and quarreled at the top of their lungs. This had never happened before. Many of them insisted on keeping their women out of the equation – it was against the ethics of war to drag women into battle. They feared they would be damned by generations to come. The rest of the council – which was the minority – failed to convince the others to include women in the fight as their enemy had done.



The war continued into the next generation. The oasis folks finally set aside their skepticism and fear of damnation. Women joined the fight. The underworld folks refused to give up. Patience was one of their dominant traits, as was determination. The underworld women decided to change their plans and employ new tactics, “If we cannot make our foe’s women suffer and shed tears of blood, then it is not war but child’s play,” they would protest.

To defeat an enemy, one must strike where it kills. The underworld women struck the oasis women in their most valuable trait. A trait that is also a weakness – posterity.

At first, it seemed natural. Losing an infant in the oasis was not out of the ordinary. But the death of many infants was alarming. It became suspicious and horrifying when the folks realized that all the dead infants were males. The oasis women took all precautions to protect their soon-to-arrive heirs, but to no avail. The infants would die just a few days after their birth. No one understood the cause of these deaths. It was a mystery that filled them with sorrow.

Every alley in the oasis mourned. The cemetery’s gate remained open to the little ones. A dark cloud hung over the oasis. The folks had lost their joy in life – no more dancing or singing. Although the women kept singing, the tunes they sang were different now. Their songs no

longer celebrated the victories of their heroic men, but rather reflected their loss and bitterness. The men feared the underworld folks would gloat over their pain, so they tried to keep the women from singing sad songs but failed. The women's broken hearts could not be mended.

The oasis women gave birth to more baby boys, but those sons too met the same fate. Just as the oasis celebrated the newborn and ululations filled the air, a week later, wailings and cries were heard in the same household, and a new grave was dug in the cemetery. No means of defense and protection could stop the constant loss of newborn males.



Years went by. The alleys of the oasis were empty, bereft of young boys running around joyfully. Elderly women in the oasis longed to have them gather around for story times. Their laughter and quarrels were deeply missed. Only the echoes of crying souls were to be heard.

The underworld folks expected the oasis folks to surrender and give in to their terms, but the response they got was a strong one, a statement that came from the same aching hearts – the mothers who lost their little ones, “We will not let the underworld women gloat over us.” With great faith and utmost trust in their women, the men of the oasis let them lead that they might put an end to this tragedy once and for all. Some of the folks in the oasis avoided marriage to save themselves the pain of losing a child. Others left the oasis to settle and start a family away from home and the endless war. The few who remained in the oasis stayed on to fight for their happiness, for life. So they threw wild and luxurious wedding parties as a symbol of resistance.

The underworld folks were perplexed by the challenge and resistance of the oasis women. The women's patience and endurance drove them mad. They were expecting a messenger from the oasis folks to negotiate a truce and submit to their authority, but that messenger never came.

The war never stopped, nor did the grudge.

The more male infants died, the more tolerant the women of the oasis grew.

10

160

For every end of a war there is a beginning.

It all started with Hasnaa. She ended up as her parents' only child after losing and mourning many brothers. Her only cousin, though, miraculously survived. They said it was because he was born somewhere away from the oasis. He only returned to the oasis with his father to ask her hand in marriage. She happily accepted. Her friends and relatives all gathered around her after word of the engagement spread. Some were happy for her, others were envious, but they all warned her of her unavoidable and devastating fate, "You will suffer greatly, dear. It is less painful to stay unmarried than to lose a child." She neglected their warnings with a smile. And unlike them, who preferred to stay unwedded, she chose to marry and start a family.

The groom threw his bride a massive wedding and disregarded all criticism, "Life must go on. We must spread joy in the oasis. One cannot live if one cannot be happy. Our grief will only help our enemy."

From the early weeks of her new life with her husband, something started to move in her womb. Her fear overshadowed her joy. To protect her child, she kept her pregnancy a secret from everyone, including her husband. She managed to hide it from all eyes, but surely, not for long. Her husband received the news with heedful joy. Time went by fast. Their heir was soon to arrive. She shielded herself with protection spells but still had doubts and fears. Her son was born. Ululations filled the air for the first time in years. Hasnaa was overjoyed. She surrounded her newborn with protection spells summoned from all four corners of the earth. But as they said, "You cannot fight fate."

110

Like all the other infants lost, her little boy was buried in the cemetery. He lived in his mother's arms for one day then left her heartbroken, tears running down her face. She mourned her child and accepted condolences in her Kubit. Her weeping was heartbreaking. Her husband kept his composure for her sake. He tried to stay strong even though it broke him. He, too, needed comfort.

As her beloved ones surrounded her with love in her grieving, she could sense their scolding of her for neglecting their advice and constant warnings. The tears she shed were enough to turn the desert into a green orchard. She realized that she, too, now shared their

pain, the pain of losing a child. Her failure to protect her boy from the evil-doing of the underworld folks was a source of constant despair.

One night she stopped weeping, not that the tears of a childless woman could ever dry up, nor that she feared her mourning would turn her face pale, but because she had to find a way to protect her next child. She refused to let the underworld women take joy in her loss ever again, "Thinking of my loss will only bring me more tears."

There had to be a way, a weapon to defeat them.

A new heir was coming. She had to gather her thoughts and put together a plan to protect him. So she visited all those who lost their infants in the oasis and even in neighboring areas. She listened to their stories with keen attention and returned home with worries piled up like a mountain. But she would not let that break her spirit.

She prepared herself for the imminent arrival of her son. There he was, a healthy baby boy with a beautiful smile. However, his fate in life was not so beautiful. He, too, joined his brother and the other infants in the cemetery after only four nights in his parents' arms. This time Hasnaa refused to accept any condolences. She grew more insistent and determined than ever to defeat the underworld folks.



Time went by, and her third and fourth children met the same fate, managing only to survive a few more days than the first two. And despite the various precautionary measures she took, the result was always the same – death. And in every bitter experience, her tears would run dry to a point where she wished her next newborn would be a girl. But her womb would only give her boys. Her wounds never healed. She did, though, notice one thing: in each case, her child had died when she left him out of her sight. It seemed to her that the underworld folks took advantage of her absences to take her heir away for good.

Her fifth child lived longer than his brothers, but still only for a few weeks.

"A moment of distraction can cost a life."

This time she sobbed violently, crying her eyes out. She thought she had finally overcome her misfortune, but she had been defeated again, a victim of distraction. Yet she refused to give up. It puzzled her for a while – how could the underworld folks break through all these protection spells? There had to be an explanation. There had to be a

way, an effective weapon to fight this.



162

One evening she learned she was pregnant again. She panicked, fearing for her child, that he would meet the same miserable, unavoidable fate as his brothers before him. It made her anxious and sad that this child would be nothing but bait in this endless war, another piece of wood to feed this destructive fire.

The oasis folks had suffered greatly throughout the previous years and someone had to end this suffering.

She thought and thought, trying to understand how she could protect the life of her coming heir, until finally, her thinking bore fruit. Something crossed her mind. She realized that the distraction was not of sight but hearing. How did the underworld folks get to their target? They must have a way. Could it be through eavesdropping? More strongly than ever, she believed that she finally had the answer; but she did not reveal it immediately. She needed to make sure she was on the right path to victory.

The underworld folks could get to an heir through one way only. Not through the bond with his father, but through the unbreakable bond with his mother. A child may carry his father's name, yet may he might grow unfond of him and even forget him, but he would always remember the womb that carried him. The connection between a mother and child is beyond the umbilical cord and nutrition, a connection too strong to be severed. It is a connection of warm love and secrets. Once the umbilical cord is cut, a new bond is created between mother and child. The underworld folks knew that what would break the oasis men the most was seeing their women weep. It was their technique to win the war all along.

But the women of the oasis were much stronger and more resistant than the enemy ever expected. Their men were empowered by their strength.



That evening Hasnaa stayed home and gathered her thoughts. Her mind flashed back through all the stories she had heard from the other mothers in the oasis. She discovered that all along, she and the others had one thing in common – the timing of the infants' deaths. There

was no single doubt in her heart now. Death took those little boys the moment they were given a name. The child's name was the enemy's weapon. She wiped a tear running down her cheek and decided it would be her last.

She now had a trick that would win her the war and a smile on her face.

The women of the oasis had struggled hard throughout all these years to save their sons from the evil-doings of the underworld women but had failed and suffered. Their constant failure was a result of their misunderstanding of their foes' trick.

To shield yourself from your enemy, you must know his weapon. Knowledge is key.

Hasnaa worked hard to prepare herself for her child's arrival. She would help him see the light in a world full of darkness. She now knew the underworld folks' advantage; she would fight back with the same weapon – fight invisibility with invisibility. The trick was not to hide her newborn from their eyes but their ears. With complete faith in her plan, Hasnaa had no choice but to fight. And so the heir finally arrived. She celebrated his birth as if he were her firstborn. The luxurious and wild celebration to welcome his birth amazed all the women in the oasis. Her message to the underworld women was loud and clear. A week later, she asserted, "They will not get him this time."

Her guests carried the news of her bold challenge across the oasis. Hasnaa was the talk of both men and women, even members of the council. That day, her husband gave their son a name that was announced to all the folks in the oasis. His mother, in addition, secretly gave him another name. He carried two names that day. She never spoke the name his father gave him. The oasis folks all waited for the results of her challenge with great anticipation. What a war, they all thought, a familiar enemy, unorthodox weapons, and an unknown fate.

Weeks went by. Women of both worlds were puzzled at Hasnaa's intelligence, which she used to keep her boy alive. The underworld women were unable to get to him. As for the oasis women, they were divided into three groups: the first, which was the majority, were happy for the child's safety. The second, which was few, envied Hasnaa for succeeding in keeping her heir alive and well, and the last group, which was also large, lamented having avoided tying the knot for all those years.

But all three groups wanted one thing – Hasnaa’s secret.



164

Curiosity was killing everyone in the oasis, including members of the oasis council who requested the husband’s presence. They needed an explanation. It frustrated them when the husband confessed to not knowing his wife’s secret, “It was a war between women. I had nothing to do with it,” he replied. Then he added, “What matters though is that we won.” The underworld folks, too, needed to know the secret that cost them to lose a lethal weapon in such a short time.

The council gathered for a meeting that lasted for days, then issued a statement that was not as transparent and straightforward as the oasis folks were used to. It had only two words, “Farewell Sorrow.” The folks then knew it was good news.

Hasnaa finally let her secret out. She whispered it to every woman in need of the weapon. They all had to be cautious so the underworld women wouldn’t hear and break through. And for the first time in the history of the oasis, women were able to keep a secret from each other.



The oasis had finally learned to laugh again. Weddings were being held in every corner. Women sang new, cheerful songs and instrument players played new enchanting tunes. The oasis was lively again with children running around and playing, the elderly overjoyed to narrate their stories once again. They had new stories that entertained the little ones and kept them up all night. Members of the council all breathed sighs of relief and celebrated the end of a war they thought would last for eternity.

The underworld folks declared their defeat and surrendered. They even sent a peace delegate for reconciliation. Members of the oasis council accepted on one condition – permission to join in listening to the oasis folk’s music. It was the only thing they truly enjoyed and inexplicably could not resist.

And so, the war between the two worlds finally reached an end. Thereafter, surely there were a few skirmishes here and there, but it did not break the peace between the two folks or stop them from enjoying music together.



Reviews of Books

In Vested Interests: From Passion to Patronage, The AbdulMagid Breish Collection of Arab Art, edited by AbdulMagid Breish, Louisa MacMillan, & Mysa Kafil-Hussain (Skira Editore, 2020)

The art catalogue—not the monograph, exhibition review, or the peer-reviewed article—is the predominant form of discourse when it comes to the art of the Arabic-speaking world. Normally, catalogues cover exhibitions, such as *Arabicity* (2017) or collections, like the recent *Reflections* (2020) volume which details the British Museum’s Middle East and North Africa collection, consisting mostly of paper-based works and the subsequent 2021 debut of the collection in exhibition-form at the British Museum itself. While many private collectors and art funds have made their collections available online, like the Barjeel Foundation Collection or the Dalloul Art Foundation, collecting strategies are often not part of the discourse. The recent *In Vested Interests: From Passion to Patronage, The AbdulMagid Breish Collection of Arab Art* is an exception to this rule, with multiple lengthy essays about collecting by the collector himself, Libyan-British banker AbdulMagid Breish. However, the strength of the collection lies beyond the sheer transparency of the project: a significant portion of the Breish Collection consists of Libyan art. In a field where most major collections of art from the Arabic-speaking world often hold a single work of art by a Libyan artist, if any, the Breish Collection represents major documentation of contemporary Libyan art and a resource for the field of contemporary art history.

In Vested Interests, edited beautifully by Louisa MacMillan and Mysa Kafil-Husseini, begins with various introductory notes to the reader, including Breish’s biography, his collecting methods, a short history of Middle Eastern art sales by Nima Sagharachi, and an essay on investing by Breish. It positions the reader to enter the collection itself, which is organized, not by theme like other major catalogues or

even by artist, but rather by how art fits into the Breish Collection as an investment. First comes “Blue-Chip” investments, which are stable and low-risk: in the Breish Collection these are largely by dead masters like Inji Aflatoun (1924-1989) and Seif Wanly (1906-1979). “Large-Cap” follows, representing living masters, “Medium-Cap,” “Small-Cap.” “Secluded Markets,” which is where we find the majority of the Libyan work, represents an effort to elevate Libya’s art and to function as a more local patron of Libyan art. “Diversification,” the final section, is where the reader will find some non-Arab artists, including Lorna Selim (b. 1928) as well as 3-D works and mixed media. In Diversification, Breish included iconic collages of Mohammad Omar Khalil (b. 1936), one of which is titled *Gaddafi* (2011); Khalil is also a friend of Breish, who he met through the artist Dia al-Azzawi (b. 1939). Needless to say, Azzawi is well represented in the Breish Collection, including some works he made specifically for Breish. Several essays conclude the book, some by artists themselves in Breish’s circles, like Azzawi and Khalil, commenting on pieces commissioned by Breish or inspired by conversations with him: Breish thus establishes himself as not only a collector but a patron of the arts.

Of the many reasons the Breish collection is significant, its representation of Libyan art is the most compelling: it is perhaps the strongest documented collection of Libyan art in recent history. Most museum collections and gallerists feature one or two Libyan artists if any; this tends to represent artists living outside of Libya, mostly because of how historically artists have been treated within Libya. They were often prohibited from leaving Libya to exhibit their works abroad during Gaddafi’s reign, and thus have remained largely isolated from the international market. The Breish Collection gathers ten Libyan artists in particular: Mohammad Barudi (1931-2003), Ali Ezouik (b. 1949), Yousef Fatis (b. 1966), Najla Shawkat al-Fitouri (b. 1968), Ali Gana (1936-2006), Bashir Hammouda (b. 1948), Taher el-Maghrebi (1941-2017), Ali al-Muntasser (b. 1967), Ali Mustafa Ramadan (b. 1938), and Salem al-Tamimi (b. 1956). The works are mostly paintings and prints; outside of the Secluded Markets section of *In Vested Interests*, the Breish Collection includes a sculpture in Large Cap investments by Ali Mustafa Ramadan made of brass alloy titled *Dynamic Shape of the Eye* (1987); it is a model of a larger structure outside of Tripoli’s main eye hospital. Breish himself explicitly states that he wanted to support Libyan artists in the light of the Arab Spring in 2011; Libyan artists were documenting events as it happened and, in

turn, should be collected and acknowledged.

While the group of Libyan artists represented is small, their work generally straddles the line between abstraction and the portrayal of everyday life: human figures and the city represented in geometric blocks of color, along with more classical examples of portraiture. The overall effect is that, by emphasizing how and why Libyan artists have been under-represented, Breish himself is demonstrating how greater inclusivity should be a critical element of the arts market going forward. Neither Breish or his editors are ever anything but respectful of Libyan art: their comments encourage the reader to think about the market and the historical events that shape how art travels, versus any misplaced statements about the quality of Libyan art itself. On a similar note, *In Vested Interests* makes an argument for Libya as an art center of the Arabic-speaking world, if it were paid more attention. The centers of art production in the region have shifted with political and cultural winds, but usually Egypt, Iraq, Morocco, and Sudan, and depending on the decade, the Gulf and Palestine, are well-represented. Again, if we were to take *Arabicity*, a 2017 exhibition, as our example, in comparison to the Breish collection, it does not feature a single Libyan artist. While catalogues of private collections are often neglected and receive far less publicity than art exhibitions or museum collections, there is still hope that between Breish, especially given how extensive his artist-curator-academic-gallerist network is, and between recent Libyan artist initiatives both in Libya and abroad in the last five years alone, Libyan art will begin to receive more detailed documentation on all fronts.

Breish is not simply advocating for the reform of the art market through inclusivity in itself but also greater transparency in acquisitions: his own transparency should be taken as a model for ethical collecting by private collectors and by museum curators. In that way, the book stands as an indirect critique of how curators have assembled catalogues and presented collections to the general public. Curators are often focused on themes versus documenting why and how they are acquiring works: with the art of the Arabic-speaking world in particular, themes of gender, religion and politics reign supreme, almost quasi-orientalist. Breish, in comparison, explains how he understands his art, using the language of investment, then goes on to give practical advice to the would-be collector or curator, especially regarding provenance and storage. Again, Breish very clearly articulates why he believes Libyan art is important: the market was isolated and contem-

porary artists have also stood as witnesses for Libya's recent past. It is important that this call for greater transparency is coming from a Libyan collector, when major collections have been from Bilad al-Sham and the Khaleej, like the Barjeel Foundation and the Dalloul collections. Inclusivity breeds inclusivity: a Libyan collector recognizes that the holes in the market are due to poor documentation and advocates not only for better documentation, but attention to vaster markets. *In Vested Interests* is revolutionary because it could only have been assembled by a Libyan collector and his team of talented editors.

As the Breish Collection's other strengths are acknowledged by Breish and his editors themselves, there are unstated themes running through the art collection that are equally important: religion and Islam, in particular. Breish does mention an interest in Sufism and his conversations with Ibrahim el-Salahi on the Qur'an are documented in the book. These conversations led to al-Salahi's painting, *The Resurrection* (2008-9), which graces the cover of the book. The Breish Collection however should be praised for its unconventional framing around the subject of religion. Again, art catalogues tend to be quasi-orientalist in their approach to framing religion; collections will either use *hurūfiyya*, Arabic-script letterism, as a representation of religion, citing image prohibition in Islam. They might also emphasize rebellion against religion as a category on its own. Instead, the work is organized by where it fits into Breish's rubric of low risk versus high risk investments, in addition to the sections detailing his patronage of different artists. Breish goes beyond by selecting pieces that look at religion in everyday life or that play with mixed media, like ceramics.

In Vested Interests is not simply an art catalogue but a response to the curation and collection of contemporary art. Breish pushes back against how art from the Arabic-speaking world has been presented, acquired and discussed, arguing for the need for collectors to support their own communities and be transparent about what work they collect and why. In its own way, it is a subtle critique of the museum and the gallery. It will be remembered for being a major document in Libyan 20th and 21st century art.



Women in the Modern History of Libya, edited
by Barbara Spadaro & Katrina Yeaw (Routledge, 2020)

Women in the Modern History of Libya (2020) is a slim volume comprised of five articles originally published as part of a special issue of the *Journal of North African Studies* (23/5, 2018). The subject matter included in this volume ranges across an expansive time period from the Ottoman era to the present day, resulting in a loosely connected collection on the underexamined subject of women and gender in Libya. The chapters cover a variety of subjects, including space and gender in Libyan Jewish life during the Ottoman era, the silences on women in extant historical documents, the role of Libyan women in the resistance to Italian occupation, the memories and complex identities of Jews displaced from Libya to Italy, and the revival of Amazigh culture in the wake of the 2011 revolution. The introduction by the editors Barbara Spadaro and Katrina Yeaw gestures to the difficulties of cohesively framing such wide-ranging material, even as the effort to produce this series of articles speaks to the landmark nature of this work. As Spadaro and Yeaw write, “Libya remains one of the least understood and theorised regions in the Middle East and North Africa” (p. 746). Given the sparse scholarship on women and gender issues in Libya, the varied material gathered in this book provides multiple entry points into the subject as well as avenues for future research and collaboration.

The sources consulted in the chapters include the archives of three countries, Italy, Britain and the US, as well as the collection *Mawsūʿat riwāyāt al-jihād* (Oral Narratives of the Jihād) at the Libyan Studies Center in Tripoli. The first chapter in the book, “Centre and periphery: variations in gendered space among Libyan Jews in the late Ottoman period” by Rachel Simon, presents a report on gender, space and interaction in Libyan Jewish life during this period, largely selected from Mordecai Hacohen’s ethnographic accounts, interpreting and imagining the realities of life during this period. In this chapter

and throughout the volume, there is an insistence that the silence of records must be scrutinised, as the authors grapple with interpreting the lacunae within extant sources and what might be distorted or missing from the records. This work is most evident in the second chapter, “Finding women and gender in the sources: toward a historical anthropology of Ottoman Tripoli,” where Nora Lafi addresses how to write history without depending entirely on those traces of the past that we are able to salvage. In a resonant example of such silences, Lafi mentions a murdered woman who appears in the records only in the anonymous form of “wahda mafsûda,” a corrupted girl.

The issue of access to existing archives and the silence on the colonial period is discussed at length in the chapter “Gender, violence and resistance under Italian rule in Cyrenaica, 1923–1934,” where Katrina Yeaw notes that “[t]he vast majority of the Italian sources from this period remain inaccessible to researchers” (p. 794). Yeaw turns to alternate sources, creatively stitching together accounts to study “the pivotal relationship between gender and violence under Italian colonial rule, which shattered existing forms of social organisation through a variety of policies, most dramatically the use of internment camps” (p. 792). Yeaw cites the important work of Ali Ahmida on the making of modern Libya, and the discussion in this chapter resonates with both the methods and ideas in Ahmida’s scholarship, including his recent book *Genocide in Libya: Shar, a Hidden Colonial History* (Routledge, 2020) which seeks to counter the ignorance of and indifference to the atrocities committed during this period. Ahmida and Yeaw’s accounts constitute the beginning of a conversation which should hopefully provoke wider debate about the enduring legacies of Italian colonialism in Libya.

The theoretical and methodological frameworks deployed in *Women in the Modern History of Libya* vary greatly, as promised by the introduction, which lists inspirations in gender and postcolonial studies, transnational history, feminist intersectional methodology, memory studies and literary criticism. Some of the chapters are more clearly motivated by engagements with these fields than others. Memory studies is most central to Barbara Spadaro’s chapter, “Remembering the ‘Italian’ Jewish homes of Libya: gender and transcultural memory (1967–2013)” which turns to oral histories to reflect on different modes of remembering, usefully positing three mnemonic processes (remembering, forgetting, fantasising) through which to understand the performative and gendered dimensions of memory narratives.

Ideas drawn from performance and affect studies add to the rich reflective quality of the fifth and final chapter, “Our star: Amazigh music and the production of intimacy in 2011 Libya” by Leila Tayeb, which weaves together ethnographic material and interviews to reflect on issues of Amazigh indigeneity, intimacy, and the potential of imagining alternatives during the revolutionary period.

173

The volume at times misses the opportunity for more substantial engagement with writing by Libyan intellectuals and writers, in particular women. In their introduction, Spadaro and Yeaw present a case for the ground-breaking nature of the volume by stating that the research on Libya is so scant that “to date no publications on women and gender have targeted the region” (p. 746). Nora Lafi somewhat modifies this statement in her chapter, naming scholars from North Africa, including Amal Obeidi in Libya, who have “dedicated their work to the writing of the history of women” (p. 770). The relatively rare references to Arabophone scholarship in Anglophone research is testament to a broader problem: the divides that remain between scholarship in globally dominant languages and the work of scholars and writers in the region. With this caveat, this volume is a vital introduction to this subject, doing its part to overcome the lack of scholarship on gender issues in Libya in the global north and condensing a rich variety of material within its 120 pages.



Eileen Ryan, *Religion as Resistance: Negotiating Authority in Italian Libya* (Oxford University Press, 2018)

Eileen Ryan's book *Religion as Resistance: Negotiating Authority in Italian Libya* focuses on the role of the Catholic Church in the making of Italian colonial and imperial history. It also covers the negotiations between the Italian colonial state and the Sanusiyya socio-religious order (flourishing roughly 1858-1931) in eastern Libya during the period between 1904 and 1931. The author is to be commended for choosing a novel topic and unearthing both archival and published Italian sources that have not been examined before. The book, based on the author's Ph.D. dissertation in history at Columbia University, approaches the topic through the traditional method of diplomatic history.

Ryan's primary sources for the book are Italian colonial state archives and published policies. They include debates and views of colonial officials, military leaders, journalists, diplomats, intelligence officers, spies, clergy, and other advocates of the colonial project and empire. However, the title of the book is somewhat misleading. First, religion as resistance is not relevant to empire-making in Italy, where Ryan argues that the Church joined the colonial project. Second, in Libya, her focus is not on the resistance itself, but rather on the negotiations between the pragmatic Sayyid Muhammad Idris al-Sanusi and the colonial officials. Third, the book, focusing on Italian-Libyan negotiations, does not quite cover the whole country, since the focus is primarily about the negotiations with the Sanusiyya order in Barqa, the eastern region of Libya.

Ryan focuses on the intersection of religion and empire, or more specifically on the role of religion in the making of Italian imperialism (p. 4). She does not single out one central thesis but rather states several points of significance. First, the making of Italian colonialism brought the Catholic Church and the state together after decades of

conflict and tension between them. The Italian state adopted what she terms “religious traditionalism” different from the French and British models of secular colonialism (p. 5). Yet this view of European colonialism in Africa ignores what the British historian Basil Davidson calls “The Gun and the Bible” concept when missionary Christianity was an integral part of empire building, and participated in converting the natives as a strategy to impose imperial domination in Africa. Second, Italian officials assumed they were different and they would win the allegiance of Libyan Muslims, particularly the Sanusi leaders, prior to the conquest and during the period of negotiations between 1904 and 1922. In reality, the overall relationship seems to be ambiguous and uncertain among Italian colonial officials and the Sanusi leaders despite the fact that Idris al-Sanusi agreed to negotiate after the military defeat of his cousin Sayyid Ahmad al-Sharif by the British army in the western desert of Egypt in 1915 and 1916. Sayyid Ahmad was reluctant because he wanted to focus on the war against the Italian army, and not to cut off his supply chain from Egypt, but he entered the war due to strong pressure by his Ottoman military allies.

The organization of Ryan’s book follows chronologically the various stages of Italian colonial contacts and negotiation with the leaders of the Sanusiyya, with more focus on the period from 1904 to 1931. The introduction and chapter one are general and not very clear. The real start of the book is chapter two, “Crafting Italian Approach to Colonial Role.” In this chapter, Ryan unearths new Italian material on the evolution and contestation of Italian colonial thinking about Libya. Chapter three examines Italian colonial policy and the changing policies toward Islam and the Sanusiyya, and completes her analysis of the complex politics of these policies by reviewing the work of Anna Baldinetti in her book *The Origins of the Libyan Nation* (Routledge, 2010). Ryan adds new details on the role of competing figures and groups such as Enrico Insabato, the Italian diplomat, spying informants’ networks, propaganda in Egypt, and the early contacts with the Sanusi order. In the early period between 1911 and 1916, Italian expectations for being welcomed and accepted by people in Libya turned out to be delusional. Instead, the native anti-colonial resistance by volunteer-based small armies were well organized, brilliant, and effective. This determined anti-colonial resistance culminated in the Italian defeat in 1915 at Gasr Bu Hadi—what Libyans call al-Gardabiyya—by Libyan resistance groups from all three regions of the country. Over 500 Italian soldiers and colonial troops were killed, and the career of Colonel Miani, the Italian commander, was ruined. Consequently, Ital-

ian control was reduced to a few coastal cities, and the Libyan resistance controlled most of the interior and the hinterland. The Italian colonial state was forced to negotiate, and in turn, the Sanusi leadership, after its military defeat by the British army along the Egyptian border, was ready to negotiate under the new, accommodating leader of the order, Sayyid Idris al-Sanusi. This is the historical context that paved the way for the Italian and Sanusi negotiations, but Ryan could have done more to emphasize it. In short, the two sides had a mutual interest to negotiate based on the new military realities pushing the Italian state, the Sanusi leadership, and the British colonial interest in keeping their security in Egypt, to reach the agreements known as the Accords of 'Akramah, al-Rajma, and Bu Maryam. These Accords led to the creation of a Sanusi Emirate and the recognition of Sayyid Idris as an emir of the interior of Barqa, with a capital in the city of Ajdabiya. Ryan's treatment of the colonial visions and debates are valuable, but the analysis of the Sanusiyya tends towards orientalist. Ryan seems to uncritically accept Eurocentric and colonial sources, thereby reducing the Sanusiyya order to an essentialist model of a Sufi *tariqa*. Her critique of E. E. Evans-Pritchard's work on the Sanusiyya thus misses the point; despite the fact he was working for the British colonial state, he viewed the dynamics of the order from within and realized its innovation and complexity.

Chapter four is interesting and presents new material on an overlooked topic: the role of railways in colonial policy. The author argues that Italian colonial and military officials were eager to build railways for logistical and mobility reasons, and Sayyid Idris found this project beneficial for development of the region as well. Yet resisting tribes and other Libyan leaders objected to this project, and consequently only a few railway lines were completed. This cooperation with the Sanussiyya ended when the Fascist party took power in Rome and decided to dismiss all previous accords and agreements.

Chapter five examines the violent fascist policy in Libya after 1922, which ultimately decimated the local population by 1934. Yet Ryan does not specify the impact of this policy on Libyan society, including the loss of one third of its population, and the forced exile of over 60,000 people. This genocidal colonial history is not recognized directly in the book, and the section on the concentration camps is mentioned only in passing. The new material in this chapter is the role of Luigi Federzoni, a fascist minister of the colonies between 1922-1924, and 1926-1928. According to Ryan, he played an early and

significant role in making the policy of the destruction of the Sanusi order and the resistance (pp. 136-138). Federzoni's role has not been recognized before. Finally, the book's conclusion is brief, and somewhat disappointing, as it does not address the larger significance of the material and the period under investigation, nor connect with the original questions and arguments which the book raise, and their implications for the study of Italian imperial and Fascist colonization.

The author made a choice to read the Italian colonial project through the top-down method of diplomatic history and language. She applies categories such as elite versus masses, pacification, Bedouins, tribalism, and modernizing mission, often without contextualization. This is surprising, especially after four decades of critical debates on orientalism, colonial, and postcolonial scholarship in general, which have replaced elitist and colonial diplomatic history, and examined instead the process and discourses of the production of colonial knowledge, power, class, gender, and subaltern agency. The author seems to ignore these critiques of colonial racism and the invention of race and the nation-state as a model.

Thus, this work tends towards problematic in both methods and application. It examines a new topic—that of the role of the church and colonial debates in the making of colonial policy in Libya—but uses uncritical colonial language, assumptions, and methods of reading colonial archival material. One has to raise some critical questions: Is Italian society just the view by the elite and should it include the role of regions, class, gender and culture? Is colonialism in Libya simply a modernization or a racist genocidal experience? There is a difference between studying and accepting Italian colonial perceptions, fantasies, and policy on Libya as facts, and the study of Libyan history from the point of view of the Libyan people. There are three main problems of method and language in the book. First, Ryan reads and accepts the colonial archives as facts without critical context, but rejects oral history. Inevitably then real history is Italian colonial history. Some of the blurbs for the book seem to share this view as well. What is missing is a questioning of the process of making the archives and the specific choice for organizing and using them for the sake of domination and control. For example, she accepts the colonial language of pacification and pacified (pp. 80, 81, 149, 162-163). Colonial agreements for the partition of Africa including Tripoli and Libya are seen as international agreements (pp. 4, 20), when they were of course not. Second, while the author not only accepts colonial archives as facts, she questions

the use of oral history in Libya organized by the Libyan Studies Center. This is a troubling choice, knowing that the Libyan Studies Center has conducted one of the most impressive projects of collecting oral history in Africa and the world, under the supervision of Professor Jan Vansina, the father of modern oral history. The collected oral histories of some 15,000 Libyan resistance fighters have been transcribed and published in 43 volumes. However, Ryan chose to cite only six volumes. Furthermore, Ryan raises many problems with oral history and undermines its value (pp. 177-181). By doing so, she unintentionally confirms colonial hostility to native views of history. In one note, she cites an article critical of oral history without questioning the motives behind it; it is by an Israeli scholar critical of the Palestinian oral history project (p. 181). As another example, Ryan states that she visited the Libyan Studies Center in Tripoli, but admits that most of the history is on military battles, and in dialectal Arabic that is hard to understand (p. 174). If one cannot understand Libyan Arabic sources, then one cannot read them, which is a different challenge, and seems to be a case of dismissing subaltern voices. As well, Libya as a name is a colonial Italian invention. Up until 1911, the region was *Ṭrābulus al-Gharb*, as an Ottoman province. In addition, the use of *tariqa* and Bedouin are misleading, even orientalist, terms that do not reflect the changing reality of living culture, social movements, and peasant and kinship organizations. Ryan's book has opened new doors for the study of religion in the making of Italian empire. Nevertheless, the field is still waiting for further critical scholarship on colonial, orientalist, Eurocentric assumptions, and diplomatic Italian fantasies of empire.



عدة نشاطات مثل جلسة حوارية فنية مع الفنانين زينب بوبكر وتيوا برونوسه ومشاهدة لفلم جماعي. ساهم هذا الحدث في دمج السياق المحلي الليبي والعالمي عن طريق عرض اعمال المشاركين الليبيين وغير الليبيين التي تستهدف قضايا محلية وعالمية في مساحة المعرض كدعم وترويج لأفكارهم، وفي الوقت ذاته لايمال المواضيع النقدية و التعددية والتنوع الذي يتجلى في نتائج المسابقة الى الجمهور المحلي الليبي وتوليد حوارات جماعية حولها تتجاوز حدود التخصص والحدود الجغرافية المحلية.

حالياً نحن بصدء تنفيذ اكبر واهم مشروع بالنسبة لنا حتى الان، مشروع المسيرة، وهو منصة فكرية، فنية، ومعمارية، تسعى لدعم الممارسين الإبداعيين الليبيين الشباب لتوليد حراك وخطاب اجتماعي نقدي واصلاحي نحو المساهمة في صياغة وتحقيق رؤى مشتركة لاعادة اعمار المنظومة القيمية والعمرانية الليبية، بوسائل الفكر والفنون البصرية والمعمارية. سيتكون المشروع من عدة ورش عمل وحوارات ومعارض ومنشورات، وستكون مدة تنفيذه سنتين ابتداءً من 2022 الى نهاية 2023.

ختاماً اريد ان اختصر كل ما تعرضت له من افكار ومجهودات في قلبي ان تجرّد ليست مؤسسة مجتمع مدني منتجة فحسب، بل هي مشروع ثقافي فني حد ذاته قيد التنفيذ، وبعيد كل البعد عن الإكتمال، يريد الا تحصره اي حدود جغرافية او اجتماعية او ايدولوجية كانت، وانما ان يتجرّد من كل هذه القيود للتفكر فيها ووضعها على محك الشك والتساؤل والتحدّي. وفي ليبيا ما احوجنا الى اعادة فحص حدودنا و قيمنا ومعتقداتنا الموروثة التي تتسرب الى كل ممارساتنا الحياتية والمهنية، ونحن كمعماريين وفنانين نبدأ بهذه المهمة النقدية عبر تكريس تخصصاتنا كمشاريع نقدية بعينها، وليس كاتنتاجات جمالية وعملية فحسب. وعلى الطريق الطويل الوعر نحو تحرير وعينا في هذه البقعة الجغرافية من الارض المبتلية والمثيرة للإهتمام في نفس الوقت، نأمل ان ننهض من جديد كأفراد وشعب كلما سقطنا وكلما تعرقلنا بالإبتلاءات.

ابداعيين وخبراء من نفس مجالاتنا، للعمل معا على مواضيع لا تنحصر فقط على الواقع المحلي الليبي، بل تتجاوز الحدود الجغرافية وتشارك فيها مع شعوب و دول اخرى.

١٨٢

اول مبادرة لنا في هذا الاستوديو الرقمي الدولي هو مشروع «اراضي مضادة»، الذي يتكون من ورشة عمل افتراضية ومسابقة فنية، ومعرض جماعي. يسعى المشروع الى التعريف بتقنية ترسيم الخرائط المضادة، وهي اداة جغرافية شبه منسية اليوم، ولا تلاقي اي اهتمام خصوصاً في المشهد المعماري والجغرافي و الفني الليبي. تعرّف هذه الاداة باختصار على انها استخدام رسم الخرائط كوسيلة مقاومة او جدال ضد ظاهرة او واقع ما، وليس فقط كوصف لبيئة قائمة او كاقترح لاقامة شيء جديد. تاريخياً استخدمت هذه التقنية كثيراً من قبل الشعوب القديمة «الاصلية» التي كانت تعاني من قمع خرائط المستعمرين واقصاءهم لمواقع وجود تلك الشعوب على الخرائط الرسمية، وبالتالي لجؤوا لاعادة رسم خرائطهم الخاصة التي تفصح عما لا يقال او يظهر في الخرائط التي ترسمها الطبقات الاقوى. ولكن ما علاقة هذه التقنية بواقعنا اليوم المحلي والعالمي؟

تكمن حاجتنا الى هذه الاداة اليوم في كونها تسمح لنا كمعماريين وفنانين بالتعامل مع اشكالات خارجه عن اطار تخصصاتنا الابداعية، كالقضايا الجيوسياسية والاجتماعية والاقتصادية، وبحكم تعقيد وتشبيك واقعنا الحاضر بين مواضيع الحدود والانتماء والهجرة والارض والنفوذ والاستعمار الخ.. فانه ليس هنالك بد من تمكين «ورنا في المجتمع كممارسين ابداعيين الا عن طريق استكشاف لغة بديلة للفهم والتعبير النقدي عن هذا الواقع، وان نجحنا في اعادة احياء تقنية ترسيم الخرائط المضادة سنكون حينها قد خطينا خطوة جوهرية نحو تفعيل مهمة المعماريين والفنانين على اساس نقدي، واكسابهم لغة جديدة فعالة تثري قواميسهم الفنية.

بدء مشروع «اراضي مضادة» باطلاق الدعوة العامة للمشاركة فيه من جميع انحاء العالم، وقد تفاجئنا بالعدد الكبير الذي استلمناه من طلبات في اول اسبوعين فقط من اطلاق الاعلان، حيث استقبلنا اكثر من 100 تقديم من اكثر من 40 دولة حول العالم من ضمنهم ليبيا طبعاً. في المرحلة التي تلت خضنا مع المشاركين في ورشة عمل رقمية لمدة اسبوع تكونت من عدة محاضرات ونقاشات اجراها ستة خبراء من دول مختلفة تناولوا فيها الافكار والمواضيع العامة عن فكرة المشروع. بعد ورشة العمل التمهيدية فتحنا مرحلة المسابقة للمشاركين حيث تعين عليهم انتاج بحوثهم وخرائطهم المضادة الخاصة للاشكاليات التي يرونها جذيرة بالاستهداف في الدول التي يختارونها. بعد فترة المسابقة التي دامت شهر ونصف استلمنا الاعمال النهائية للمشاركين التي كانت تتراوح في ابداعيتها وعمقها من مشارك الى اخر. ما كان محفزاً لنا حقاً هو اول الرسائل والدردوس التي تلقيناها منهم التي عبرت عن مدى تأثير هذا البرنامج الذي نسقناه على افكارهم الخاصة وثانياً مشاهدة تجليات فكرة ترسيم الخرائط المضادة التي قدمناها على اعمالهم في المسابقة، مما يشير الى نجاح المشروع وفاعليته العملية على الرغم من كون فكرته معقدة نسبياً وغير مألوفة.

واخيراً نظمنا معرض فني للمشروع لمدة 3 ايام في بنغازي باستضافته منظمة براح للثقافة والفنون حيث استعرض 60 عملاً فنياً وخريطة مضادة وتخللته

فرصة المشاركة في المعرض للعامة من المهتمين بالعمارة والفنون، وكان العدد الإجمالي 15 مشارك متكون من 9 فنانات و 6 فنانين، شاركو بخمسين لوحة فنية. وبعد شهرين عقب اتمام مرحلتي التخطيط والإنتاج الفني اتممنا تجهيزات فراغ المعرض وباقي الأمور اللوجستية والأمنية المملة. واطلقنا المعرض في الهواء الطلق في ميدان السلفيوم (الخالصة) لمدة ثلاثة ايام متواصلة، واندمج الحضور عبر الفضاء الذي صممناه من السقالة و الإعمدة التجريدية الحمراء متفاوتة الارتفاعات مع السكان المحليين الذين كانوا يترددون على المعرض طوال ايامه الثلاثة. كانت اهم عناصر الحدث هو الجلسة الحوارية المفتوحة التي اجريناها في ثاني ايام المعرض، وكان النقاش على الرغم من حساسية الوضع الراهن الاجتماعية والسياسية خائفاً وناقداً لعدة اشكالات حساسة تؤثر على الواقع الليبي و المدينة وسكانها.

ما شجعنا كثيراً هو ردود فعل الجمهور المختلفة نحو فكرة المعرض ومحتواه والذي بدى مبهم ومثير للفضول للبعض، وملهم للبعض، ومزج وحاد للبعض الآخر، وكان لنا من المهم استقبال كل تلك القراءات المختلفة للمشروع، إذ ان الفكرة ذاتها لا تريد ان تكون احادية المعنى ومتقبلة من الجميع بل ان تستوعب تعددية الآراء والتفسيرات، فهل تعني الإعمدة الحمراء الرتبة المفرطة والامثال في المجتمع الليبي؟ ام هل تعني صنمية معتقداتنا التقليدية التي قد تتفاوت في الاهمية؟ ام هل هي فقط اعمدة حمراء مجردة من المعنى لا تشير الا الى ذاتها؟ كانت تجربة معرض تهافت بالنسبة لنا اكثر من مشروع او حدث ثقافي، بل اول خطواتنا الفعلية لتوليد الحراك النقدي الذي نسعى لتحقيقه. وتبين لنا انه فعلاً بإمكاننا النزول الى شوارع المدينة بعيداً عن حوائط المكاتب والتفاعل مع العامة بلغة العمارة والفن والتواصل معهم بطرق ابداعية. عبر تنشيط تلك البقعة الرمزية (ميدان السلفيوم) التي اخترناها مكاناً للمعرض كانت بالنسبة لمنطقة البلاد التي كانت ولا تزال محل ألم وحزن للكثير، سبباً للتواجد فيها واعادة التفكير في ذاك الدمار «التهافت» الذي يحيطها عوضاً عن تجنبها والخوف من مواجهتها.

بعد اول خطواتنا في مواجهة الإشكاليات المحلية في ليبيا عبر العمارة والفنون وجدنا انفسنا على ابواب مواجهة اخرى من طراز اوسع.

عقب اجتياح فايروس كوفيد-٩١، كورونا في سنة 2020، شعرنا بعزلة اكثر حدة من العزلة التي تطلبها التباعد الاجتماعي والوقاية، وفي الواقع كانت ليبيا في حد ذاتها تعاني من عزلة اقدم بكثير. فحسب الدكتور نجيب الحمادي في التقرير النهائي للمسح الشمال لآراء الليبيين في القيم، اثبتت احدى مؤشرات المسح ان الليبيين اكثر الشعوب ارتياباً من الآخر الاجنبي وعدم تحبباً لمجاورته، والذي يشير الى عزلة ثقافية حادة متجذرة في الطريقة التي نرى بها انفسنا والعالم. تسائلنا كيف يمكننا كمعماريين وفنانين ليبيين تكوين نوع من التضامن العالمي مع ممارسين ابداعيين من ثقافات اخرى يشاركونا نفس التخصصات او الاهتمامات، ومن مهمة توليد الخطاب النقدي المحلي حاولنا الشروع في انتاج شبكة علاقات عالمية حتى ولو على حجم متواضع مبدئياً.

اسسنا كيان فرعي لتجذّر اطلقنا عليه «استوديو الوحدة اكس للتصميم»، كاستجابة لوضع العزلة الذي كنا نختبره. تمحورت فكرته في الاستمرار في البحث والتفكير والإنتاج الفني والمعماري عن بعد رقمياً، و بالتشارك مع ممارسين







للتجرد من هيئة البناء الجامدة والثقيلة نحو طريقة مغايرة للبناء، طريقة رمزية وتعتمد على المفاهيم الضمنية أكثر من الكتلة والوظيفة، وجاءت بعدها فكرة تشكيل فراغ معماري داخل المدينة من دون البناء الفعلي المتكامل، طريقة أكثر مرونة وخفة وحرية، تعتبر العمارة عمارة حتى ان دُمّرت او تبقى منها فقط احدى اجزاءها. وكان الالهام بالقرب منا، حيث وجدنا بعض المشاهد المتكررة في المدينة القديمة في بنغازي (البلاد) التي عم عليها الدمار بعد حرب 2014، مثل مشهد السقالة في كل مكان، و مشهد الاعمدة التي تارة نلقاها وحيدة قائمة بعد ان قصف مبناها التي كانت تدعمه، او العكس، حينما تدُمّر بعض تلك الاعمدة ويبقى المبنى متماسكا الى درجة ما، كانت تلك المشاهد وكأنها تحاكي الوضع الليبي والليبيين الذين يعايشونه، ولذلك قررنا ان ننظر هذا التناظر ذاته وان نستخدم السقالة والاعمدة كعناصر اساسية لتشكيل فراغ المعرض الذي سنعرض فيه الاعمال الفنية والمعمارية التي انتجت في المشروع.

وفي خضم هذا التصور والتخطيط خطرت لنا ان نأخذ من السقالة نفسها رمزية لحركة فنية معمارية (حركة السقالة) اساسها التحرر من سلطة المبنى وتحويل امكانية البناء الى قدرة الشعب في تشكيل فراغاته وتفكيكها واعادة تشكيلها مرة اخرى بحرية، وهنا نستنبط ايضا مفهوم مختلف وحيوي للإعمار، يأخذ من البناء حراك اجتماعي في شوارع ومساحات المدينة وليس ممارسة جامدة بين حوائط الشركات المعمارية التجارية.

امضينا ما يقارب الثمان اشهر على تحديد فكرة المشروع والتخطيط له ونتاج اعمال فنية ومعمارية نافذة للتهافت في السياق الليبي، وكانت آلية العمل متمثلة في تكليف اعضاء الفريق بمهمة ايجاد المشكلة التي يراها كل منهم جذيرة بالاستكشاف والنقح، ومن ثم انتاج اعمال فنية او معمارية فنية تفكك وتنقذ تلك المشكلة ليتم عرضها في فراغ المعرض. في الوقت ذاته قررنا ان نفتح

وبالتالي جاءت مؤسسة تجرّد للعمارة والفنون للمساهمة بإعادة احياء الممارسة والنظرية المعمارية والفنية في ليبيا وماوراءها، وذلك عبر الدعم والاستثمار في امكانات الممارسين الإبداعيين الشباب الفنية والفكرية، وتوسيعها لإستيعاب تجاربنا الخاصة التاريخية والمعاصرة من اضطرابات واشكالات ومفاهيم، و إعادة تعريفها وتنظيرها، ومقارنتها مع باقي التجارب الغربية والعالمية، لعكسها في لغة معمارية وفنية ما، سواء كانت نص، صورة، بناء، معرض، قادرة على ايمال فكرة عميقة عما نتعايشه في عصرنا الحالي، وفتح فرصة إعادة تحليلها ونقدّها ومن ثم تطوير نماذج معيشية بديلة.

غير انه في منتصف سنة 2019 على الرغم من وثوقي من خبرتي النظرية البسيطة وقتها، كنت متيقنا لعوزي للخبرة العملية في الإدارة والتنظيم من أجل تأسيس هذه الممارسة وتشغيلها، وكان يغلب عليا احيانا الشعور بالتردد والاضطراب إزاء الخوض في تجربة لم يسبق لي التعرف على طبيعتها، «كالمجتمع المدني» مثلا الذي لم اسمع به كمصطلح الا مؤخراً قبل تأسيس تجرّد بفترة وجيزة، وكنت محووظاً وقتها لتعريف على منظمة تاناروت الثقافية في بنغازي واعضاءها الكرام الذين رحبوا بنا ودلونا على اشياء صنعت فارق في مهمة بناء تجرّد، مثل الترحيب باستضافة العمل على اول مشاريعنا. بعد ان امضيت بعض الوقت في تجميع الفريق الاول في المؤسسة المتكون من معماريين ممارسين وطلبة، كان لكل منهم رغبة حماسية في تحدي الوضع القائم للعمارة والفنون في ليبيا واهتمام بفكرة تجرّد، ومن هناك شرعنا في اول مشاريعنا المفاهيمية «تهافت» الذي فاز بمنحة صندوق العربي للثقافة والفنون (آفاق) لسنة 2019 فور انطلاقنا في العمل.

مشروع تهافت كان اول فرصة لنا لاختبار شيئين مهمين، الاول افكارنا النقدية النظرية، والثاني امكاناتنا العملية في تنفيذ وتوصيل هذه الافكار للمجتمع في ارض الواقع.

كانت فكرة المشروع هي تنظير مفهوم الدمار الذي يحيط بالواقع الليبي من جوانب مختلفة، الدمار العمراني، التفتت السياسي، الفساد الاجتماعي، وغيرها من اشكالات تعبر عن عدم تماسك المنظومة الليبية اي (التهافت) الذي نعيشه. تركزت مهمتنا في إعادة تسليط هذا التهافت على نفسه واستخدامه كأداة نقدية تفككه وتسمح لنا بالتساؤل والتفكير فيه، بنفس المعنى الذي استخدمه الامام ابو حامد الغزالي في كتابه الشهير «تهافت الفلاسفة»، حيث استعرض عبره معتقدات وافتراضات بعض العلماء في عصره وفككها لتبيان هشاشتها وعدم تناسقها. ما نؤينه هو استعمال الأدوات الفنية والمعمارية كوسائط تسمح لنا بتحليل ونقد قضايا خارج التخصص المعماري او الفني، كالإيديولوجية او الاجتماعية وغيرها التي تعبر عن عدم تماسك قيم المجتمع الليبي، وبالتالي يكون دور المعماري او الفنان الليبي اكثر وعياً وحساسية وتأثيراً نحو تعقيدات الوضع الليبي بمختلف نواحيها، ومما يعني ان مفهوم العمارة او الفن هنا اصبح ليس محصوراً في بناء كتلة او صورة نهائية جميلة توفر حل او وظيفة عملية، بل «أداة» ناقدة تعالج مشاكل معينة.

ومن جهة اخرى تسائلنا كيف يمكننا تحدي مفهوم العمارة الاعتيادي وإعادة تعريفه عن طريق فضاءات المدينة الواقعية؟ وشرعنا بالتالي في محاولة

أؤسس ممارستي الخاصة التي تعتنق اغترابي عن هدف السوق المعماري الليبي وتمكنني من الإنتاج المعماري والفني الفكري، وفي الوقت نفسه تحتضن الذين يشاركونني في وعيهم بالاشكالات التي كنت استهدفها، والتي كانت كالتالي:

1. سيطرة وطمس السوق التجاري على المهنة، وضرورة وجود مساحة بسيطة ما بين البيئة الجامعية النظرية والسوق المعماري التجاري، توفر فرصة لمن يتخرجو حديثا للانخراط في الجوانب الفنية والثقافية والفكرية من المهنة المعمارية، واعادة بث الحياة في خيالهم وافكارهم، وتجريبها وعرضها في هيئة مناشط ثقافية، كورش العمل والمعارض وغيرها.

2. العزلة الثقافية في المهنة، والتي يجب علاجها عن طريق تبني نهج متعدد التخصصات لتدوير الحدود بين العمارة والفن والفلسفة والادب، ودمج الممارسين الابداعيين معا من تخصصات مختلفة كالعلوم الاجتماعية واللغويات وغيرها في مشاريع مشتركة.

3. غلب التقليد والبلادة الفكرية في المهنة والتخصص، والتي تتطلب توليد حراك وخطاب تحليلي ونقدي في مجال العمارة والفنون، كمحاولة لفهم ماضي وحاضر ما نعتنقه من نظم قيمية وفكرية، او ما يتسرب اليها بدون وعي عن طريق ما نرثه او نختبره، بمعنى اخر اعادة النظر في المؤثرات الظاهرة او الخفية التي تشكل وعينا وواقعنا كمجتمع ليبي.

1.3 والشق الثاني من هذه المقاربة يعتمد على الجانب التعليمي في العمل بألية التثقيف والنقد الذاتي المستمر المتمثلة في عدم الاعتماد على التعليم الجامعي، بل الاستمرار بالاجتهاد الخاص واعادة فحص افكارنا المسبقة بالبحوث والقراءات، والتجريب بالنظريات والتقنيات الغير تقليدية.



قبل، على الرغم من كل ما كان يبدو عليها من قوة. وتفعل ذلك حينما تتصدى لها «فكرة» مضادة من نوع ما، سواء سمينها بالثورة، أو التمرد، أو التساؤل والشك الفاعل في سطوتها، وتلك الليلة كانت كذلك، فكرة.

قبل تخرجي في بداية سنة 2018 وتحصلي على درجة البكالوريوس في العمارة من قبرص الشمالية، كنت كمعظم الرفاق الليبيين خريجي العمارة الجدد، مفعماً بطموحات إعادة أعمار واحياء ليبيا ومؤمناً بقوة المهنة المعمارية في الإصلاح والتغيير، وكلما كان يُنهش من جسد مدينتي بنغازي وقتها ويتدمر جراء الحرب كنت ازدد ايمانا وقوة واصرار على العودة بعد التخرج لاساهم بما مكنتني الله اياه. إلا انه لم يلبث هذا الإيمان في قلبي حتى استبدله شيء معاكس كلياً، الشك في كل هذه المزاعم والامال، وبدل الحماس كانت الاحباط يلتهمني رويداً رويداً، والذي كان يعبر عن صدمتي في العطب المزمّن في ثقنتا المسرفة باننا نملك ما نحتاجه لإعادة بناء ليبيا او حتى اننا نمتلك الحلول. وفجأة بدت لي ان هذه الاربعة سنين الدراسية لاتكاد تكسبني اي شيء يعوّل عليه من اجل العودة الى ليبيا باحلامي المسطحة، وان علاج واقع الدمار الفاجع في بنغازي كان ابعد مما درسناه من نظريات وتقنيات وحلول. وتساءلت، ماذا يمكن لخريج معماري جديد اعزل ان يفعل تجاه تلك الفوضى في ليبيا؟ هل سيفرق اي شيء لو قام «بإعادة اعمار» اي منشأة هوّت رماداً؟ بل و حتى لو ساهم بإعادة اعمار البلاد اجمعها، هل سيتغير اي شيء جوهرياً؟

ايقنت ان مهمتنا كمعماريين هي حتما اكبر من مجرد تشييد مباني ومنشآت، حيث ان المبنى مصيره الفناء يوماً ما لإحماله، وخصوصاً في ليبيا، واننا لا نحتمل تكلفة إعادة تأسيس اي هوية تاريخية من جديد لنبكي عليها بحرقة لاحقاً كما حدث في المدينة القديمة بنغازي. بدت لي مهمتنا في الفكرة وراء العمارة، والمعنى وراء المبنى، لان الافكار والمعاني وحدها مضادة للرصاص والقنابل، ومهمة إعادة الإعمار المادية لابد ان تسبقها مهمة إعادة اعمار فكرية، تعيد فهم ما ورثناه من افكار وايدولوجيات، تحللها، وتنتقدها وتنتظر لنهج فكري جديد يمكننا عبره استبدال افكارنا وقيمتنا ونظمنا السابقة منتهية الصلاحية، كالهوية، والتقليد، والامثال والاقتداء بالتاريخ كمرجعية، واستحداث غيرها اكثر فاعلية ومعنى، قادرة على ان تسجل وجودنا على ذاك التاريخ بأكثر من مجرد عمارة صماء اخذت محل غيرها.

متأثراً بالتراث الصوفي الذي تربيت عليه، وخصوصاً فلسفة الحركة السنوسية في ليبيا التي رأيتها الى حد ما توازي الحركات الطليعية الثقافية التي نشأت في سبعينيات القرن الماضي في الغرب، تساءلت في امكانية المساهمة في تكوين نظرية وممارسة نقدية واجتهادية في التعامل مع العمارة والفنون في ليبيا كأدوات اصلاحية كما فعلت الحركة السنوسية بمنهجها الخلدوني في توظيف فكرة «العمران البشري» في التركيز على البناء بمعنى كُلي لا يقتصر على البناء المادي فقط ولكن ايضا الفكري والاجتماعي والسياسي.

فور رجوعي الى ليبيا بعد التخرج اتضح لي ان منظومة التعليم والممارسة المعمارية والفنية في البلاد تحتاج الى اصلاح جذري لافتقارها الشديده للمناهج النقدية والتجريبية وانعزالها في النشاط التجاري. ومن هذه النقطة بعد مكفي فترة على دراسة ما كنت اطوله من كتب ونظريات معمارية وفنية، قررت ان

مؤسسة تجرّد ومهمة العمارة والفنون الإصلاحية في ليبيا وما وراءها

بعد ثورة 17 فبراير كان يبدو ان نسيج ليبيا الثقافي والاجتماعي والسياسي قد اصابه صدمة اتلفت كل تماسكه الظاهر الذي كان يخضع لسلطة القذافي. كانت المنظومة القيمية للبيين متفككة تريد ان يكون لها وحدة وهوية واستقرار حقيقي منبعه الحرية والكرامة وليس القمع والخوف. وشرعت اثر ذلك منظمات المجتمع المدني من شتى الاطرزة الاجتماعية والثقافية والفنية في اولى محاولات صنع ذلك الاستقرار وتعزيز الديمقراطية. ولكننا نعلم انه ما فتئت تلك الفترة المليئة بالامال الطوباوية والحلم حتى انهالت علينا حروب مدنية واضطرابات سياسية واقتصادية حادة تعصف بنا تداعياتها حتى يومنا هذا. يتناول هذا المقال جزء من ما قد يكون من انتاج هذه الاضطرابات المتمثل في تجربتي الشخصية نحو تأسيس حركة تجرّد الثقافية، وجزء من الاستجابات لهذه الانتاجات المنعكس في افكار ومشاريع مؤسسة تجرّد للعمارة والفنون.

في ليلة ما في احدى شوارع مدينة بنغازي في الرابعة عشر من عمري خضت اول تجربة مدنية صادمة زعمت طريقة نظري لنفسي وللعالم من حولي جذريا. تحديداً سقوط كتيبة الفضيل بو عمر في بنغازي في ايدي «الثوار» على بعد تقريباً 20 متراً مني بينما كنت اشارك في المسيرة في فضول وحماس، فقط لكي اوثق تلك المداثة بعيناي وذاكرتي، واقول تحديداً لان العديد من المنشآت كانت تسقط من سلطتها حينها، غير انه كان لكتيبة الفضيل هالة رعب ذهني خاصة لدي ما قبل احداث 17 فبراير، فقد كانت عبارة عن عمارة من السلطة القامعة بضامة اسورتها وابراجها التي تحمل جنود منتصبه قوامهم وثابتة بثقة مسرفة كالاعمدة التي تحمل المبنى تحتهم. كنت اشعر كلما امر من بعيد حول تلك الجزيرة (الدوار) المقابلة للبوابة برهبة وعدم امان شديتين. كانت عمارة من السلطة القامعة بقالها المعماري المفرط في الثبات والانتصاب، وقلبيها الايديولوجي الاخضر الذي تحميه اسورتها. فجأة بعد انبطاحنا وراء ساتر اسمنتي ما لغزارة الرصاص المنهال علينا، سمعنا وابل من الصيحات واللغات والتكبيرات بما مفاده ان الكتيبة قد تحررت وخضعت بالكامل لسيطرة الثوار.

كان الحدث في حينها لا يعدو كونه تجربة ثورية جنوبية مليئة بالفضول والحماس شرعت في سردها الى كل من اعرف وقتها تقريباً، بيد ان ما شهدته فيها كان رمزياً يخبرني من حين الى اخر انه للعمارة ايضاً سطوة فكرية تريد ان تجربنا عبرها باشياء عدة، انها ثابتة، وقوية، ومستقرة، ومتماسكة ومسيطرّة كلياً، الا انها في لحظة ما قد تهوى كل تلك القيم على الارض كما لم تهوى من